




BT 121 .S86 1849
Stowell, William Hendry
The work of the Spirit



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

THE CONGREGATIONAL LECTURE,
FOURTEENTH SERIES.

THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT.

BY WILLIAM HENDRY STOWELL.

LONDON:
BENJAMIN PARDON, PRINTER,
(LATE BLACKBURN AND PARDON,)
HATTON GARDEN.

ON

THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT.

BY

WILLIAM HENDRY STOWELL.

Ὁ νόμος τοῦ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ τῆς ζωῆς ἐν ΧΡΙΣΤΩΙ ΙΗΣΟΥ.

LONDON:

JACKSON AND WALFORD,
18, ST. PAUL'S CHURCHYARD.

1849.

P R E F A C E.

THE theme expressed in the title of this volume is one of which it can scarcely be said, with truth, that it has been neglected in any age of the Christian era. A history of the doctrines taught concerning the Holy Spirit would be interesting as illustrating the workings of the human mind; it is occasionally adduced in the following pages for the purpose of shewing into what extremes good men have been led by speculation.

It is presumed that my readers are not strangers to the principal works relating to the Spirit which have appeared in our language. Of Dr. Owen's volume, Bishop Heber has observed, it "is held in high estimation; and in default of others, has been often recommended to the perusal, not of Dissenters only, but of the younger clergy themselves. But in Owen, though his learning and piety were doubtless great, and though few have excelled him in the enviable talent of expressing and exciting devotional feelings, yet have his peculiar sentiments and political situation communicated a tinge to the general character of his volume, unfavourable alike to rational belief and to religious charity. His arrangement is lucid; his language not inelegant; and his manner of treating the subject is at least

sufficiently copious. But, as he has most of the merits, so has he all the imperfections characteristic of his age and party; a deep and various, but ill-digested reading; a tediousness of argument, unhappily not incompatible with a frequent precipitancy of conclusion; a querulous and censorious tone in speaking of all who differ from him in opinion; while his attempt to reconcile the Calvinistic doctrine of irresistible grace with the conditional promises of the Gospel, may be placed, perhaps, among the most unfortunate specimens of reasoning which have ever found readers or admirers.”*

I confess it appears to me that the writer's acquaintance with Owen's *Pneumatologia* was derived, not so much from the independent study of that great work, as from the discourse of Clagitt, written in opposition to it, and on which he remarks, not unjustly,—“with much of natural acuteness and a style which though unpolished, is seldom wearisome, Clagitt had too little learning to be ever profound, and too much rashness to be always orthodox. Where he exposes the inconsistency of the Puritan arguments, his work is not without a certain share of usefulness; but for the purposes of general edification, we may search his pages in vain; nor would he have preserved so long the share of reputation which he holds, if it had not been for the circumstance that he was Owen's principal antagonist.”

Of the Bishop's own Lectures, it has been said by

* Heber's Bampton Lectures. Second edition. Lect. I. pp. 11, 12.

one who knew him well, and who lovingly reveres his memory, "His treatise, however, on the Holy Spirit, as developed in his Bampton Lectures, seems to me to be an elaborate attempt to urge a hypothesis which is totally groundless and mistaken His work is an example of the errors wherein theologians have so frequently involved themselves, by a practice, which in other departments of knowledge would be accounted unwarrantable and perverse, of picking out a few sentences from the Bible with little, if any, regard to the context, and then spinning a theory out of them by divers logical processes."*

The plan on which these Congregational Lectures are drawn up has been gradually formed during a pastoral ministry of thirty years, and amid the engagements which have employed me through a large portion of the latter half of that period as a teacher of theology. Nothing has seemed to me to be more natural than to begin our enquiries on this subject by examining the report of human consciousness, then proceeding to the investigation of the Scriptures, and afterwards to the history of human opinions. I should have been glad if the nature of these prælections, and the limits prescribed for them, had allowed of a distinct and critical handling of all the portions of Scripture which relate to the Holy Spirit. As it is, I have contented myself with classifying those portions of Scripture, and giving the results of an enquiry which has been neither brief nor superficial.

* The Mission of the Comforter. By Julius Charles Hare, M.A., Archdeacon of Surrey. Second volume, pp. 473, 474.

It has been expected, perhaps, that I should go into a full discussion of certain opinions which have excited some controversy within the last few years, in America and in Scotland. I have not done so. The following are my reasons. First,—I am so fully convinced of the right, the duty, and the advantages of free inquiry in every department of human study, as to be jealous of every attempt on the part of the holders of opinions generally entertained by any party in the church to bear down innovators by the charge of heterodoxy, even when that charge is sustained by honoured names and by established prejudices. Whether the advocates of any particular interpretation of the Scriptures have sound or unsound reasons for adopting it, it does not appear to me that the adherents of a different interpretation are sure to serve the truth by perpetual controversy. Without shrinking from the explicit declaration of what commends itself to my judgment as true, I do not feel that I am called upon to argue the matter with every man who thinks I am in error. It may be the special duty of persons peculiarly situated, to discuss the polemical questions of their day; but not being of opinion that I am in a situation which imposes such a duty on me, I content myself with the calm discussion of great principles, leaving to those who are better qualified, and whose taste inclines that way, the treatment of local and temporary controversies. Secondly,—The controversies to which I here refer, are already in good hands; and I am not aware that I can add any force to the arguments and illustrations that have been used

by writers of great experience who have preceded me. The Letters of Sandeman—the Writings of Abraham Booth, Andrew Fuller, and Thomas Scott—the Essays on Equity and Sovereignty, by Dr. Edward Williams, whose chair it is my honour to occupy—Mr. W. Bennet's Gospel Dispensation—Mr. Hinton's Treatise on the Work of the Holy Spirit in Conversion—The late Dr. Payne's Lectures on Regeneration, with the copious notes appended to the third edition—The Correspondence of the Glasgow Churches—The Essays reprinted at New York from the Princeton Review—the second edition of Dr. Jenkyn's interesting Treatise on the Union of the Holy Spirit and the Church—and Mr. Gibson's volume on Natural and Moral Inability—all of which I have read with much care, and with no small advantage, contain the several opinions and arguments of wise and good men upon these questions. Thirdly,—The discussion of these questions has brought out the opposing mental tendencies of which a decided opinion, on one side or the other, may be taken as a fair exponent. In their *extremes*, these tendencies produce the denial of any work of the Spirit in the salvation of man, beyond that of inspiring the sacred writers; or, the assertion of some miraculous work on the mind and will of every one who is saved; but, with the exception of the case of Sandeman, I do not know that either of these extremes has been professedly avowed by any of the writers I have named. Fourthly,—It will appear in these Lectures, that, according to my judgment, the mode in which the free agency of the Spirit is related to the free agency of man in the work of human salvation is a mystery, which I make

no pretensions to explain, and of which I know not any satisfactory explanation that has ever been offered.

It has been my endeavour to write a book which should be adapted to the present state of psychical and theological speculations, by showing that neither church traditions, philosophical theories, nor mystical imaginations, are in accordance with what the Spirit of God has taught respecting His own work, but that CHRISTIAN SPIRITUALISM is the harmony of Divine Revelation with the consciousness of man.

I owe some expression of gratitude to the Committee of the Congregational Lecture, for their courteous permission to deliver in the Spring of this year, the discourses which were engaged for last Autumn. Though that postponement was made in consequence of my being laid aside by severe affliction for several months, I am thankful to God for restoring my health to publish the volume almost as early as has been usual.

The labour of transcription for the press has been cheerfully performed by gentlemen with whom it is my happiness to be associated in the Theological studies of this College, and who will allow me, I trust, in this manner to record my sense of their kind consideration.

PROTESTANT DISSENTERS' COLLEGE
at Rotherham, Yorkshire,
May 1, 1849.

ADVERTISEMENT

BY THE COMMITTEE OF THE CONGREGATIONAL LIBRARY.

THE "CONGREGATIONAL LIBRARY" was established with a view to the promotion of Ecclesiastical, Theological, and Biblical Literature, in that religious connexion with whose friends and supporters it originated. It is also designed to secure a convenient *locality* for such associations as had previously existed, or might hereafter exist, for the purpose of advancing the literary, civil, and religious interests of that section of the Christian Church to which it was appropriated. Without undervaluing the advantages of union, either with Evangelical Protestants, or Protestant Nonconformists, on such grounds as admit of liberal co-operation, it was nevertheless deemed expedient to adopt measures for facilitating the concentration and efficiency of their own denomination. In connexion with these important objects, it was thought desirable to institute a LECTURE, partaking rather of the character of *Academic prelections* than of popular addresses, and embracing a *Series of Annual Courses of Lectures*, to be delivered at the Library, or, if necessary, in some contiguous place of worship. In the selection of *Lecturers*, it was judged proper to appoint such as, by their literary attainments and ministerial reputation, had rendered service to the cause of Divine truth in the consecration of their talents to "the defence and confirmation of the Gospel." It was also supposed, that some might be found possessing a high order of intellectual competency and moral worth, imbued with an ardent love of biblical science, or eminently conversant with theological and ecclesiastical literature, who, from various causes, might

never have attracted that degree of public attention to which they are entitled, and yet might be both qualified and disposed to undertake courses of lectures on subjects of interesting importance, not included within the ordinary range of pulpit instruction. To illustrate the evidence and importance of the great doctrines of Revelation ; to exhibit the true principles of philology in their application to such doctrines ; to prove the accordance and identity of genuine philosophy with the records and discoveries of Scripture ; and to trace the errors and corruptions which have existed in the Christian Church to their proper sources, and by the connexion of sound reasoning with the honest interpretation of God's holy Word, to point out the methods of refutation and counteraction, are amongst the objects for which "the Congregational Lecture" has been established. The arrangements made with the Lecturers are designed to secure the publication of each separate course, without risk to the Authors ; and, after remunerating them as liberally as the resources of the Institution will allow, to apply the profits of the respective publications in aid of *the Library*. It is hoped that the liberal and especially the opulent friends of Evangelical and Congregational Nonconformity will evince, by their generous support, the sincerity of their attachment to the great principles of their Christian profession ; and that some may be found to emulate the zeal which established the "Boyle," the "Warburton," and the "Bampton" Lectures in the National Church. These are legitimate operations of the "voluntary principle" in the support of religion, and in perfect harmony with the independency of our Churches, and the spirituality of the kingdom of Christ.

The Committee deem it proper to state, that whatever responsibility may attach to the reasonings or opinions advanced in any course of Lectures, belongs exclusively to the Lecturer.

CONTENTS.

LECTURE I.

CAPACITIES, CONDITION, AND WANTS OF MAN, AS A SPIRITUAL BEING.

Page

Subject stated—Standard of appeal not books, but consciousness—
Spirituality of man a fact assumed—I. Enquiry respecting the
capacities of man—Language and outward signs the expression
of the inward spirit—Particular forms of speech implying the ex-
istence of spiritual capacities—Peculiarity of Scripture phraseology
on this subject—The fundamental fact in relation to the human
spirit is CONSCIOUSNESS—Christianity, though having an outward
history and a form, *is, itself*, an affair of consciousness—Man
conscious of intelligence—Conscious that his capacities are adapted
to know the true, to admire the beautiful, to choose the right,
and to enjoy the good—Facts involved in that moral constitution
of which man is conscious—1st. Free or voluntary action—2nd.
Desires and affections prompting to action—3rd. Regarding some
actions as wise and good because they are *right*—4th. Judging
himself, and his own free acts—5th. Of good or evil, happiness
or misery, of seeking the one and avoiding the other. II. Enquiry
respects the *present state* of the spirit of man in relation to God—
The judgment each man forms of himself—Of other men—The
mode in which man has dealt with religion illustrative of his pre-
sent state.—He prefers the material to the spiritual; he chooses
the false rather than the true; the speculative rather than the

practical; the sentimental rather than the moral; the human rather than the Divine. III. Enquiry relates to the *wants* of the human spirit—While adapted to the right, the wrong is chosen—Must arise either from weakness in the human spirit, or from an irresistible motive from without, or from an inward spontaneous predisposition which issues in a wrong choice—The first takes away the ground of responsibility—The second does not account for numberless instances of wrong choice in opposition to instruction, example, and conscience—The third accounts for the wrong choice, and for *every wrong choice*.—The want of man is, a disposition to choose the right, the pure, and the good. IV. Enquiry relates to the way in which this want is to be supplied—A question beset with difficulty—Must be a work which does no violence to man's free and active nature—Nor to the principle of moral government, *i.e.*, man bearing the praise or blame of his own acts—Nor be conceived of as arising out of the relations established in God's moral government of man—While mysterious, not more mysterious than other Divine acts—And must be clearly taught in Scripture—The temper of mind in which the Scriptures should be consulted on this subject 1

LECTURE II.

THE GENERAL DOCTRINE OF THE SCRIPTURES RELATING TO THE HOLY SPIRIT.

We can form a conception of God as a Spirit from what we know of our own spiritual nature—We know what is meant by spiritual acts—If a work of the Spirit in man is needed, the Scriptures alone must teach what that work is—We are taught that there is a work of God in man which secures his salvation—This the work of the Holy Spirit—Some preliminary enquiries respecting the Holy Spirit—What we understand by the phrases "The Spirit," "Holy Spirit"—Sometimes denote the general fact of Divine agency—Employed also to describe an intelligent, energetic agent distinct from the Father and from the Son—Scripture statements involve this distinction—Union and distinction in the Godhead a mystery, yet a revealed fact—Human opinions respecting this fact not to be received as Divine teaching—Statements of Scripture respecting the distinct relative agency of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit—Questions arising out of the fact of unity and distinction in the Godhead which neither

consciousness nor experience enables us to solve. II. Preliminary enquiry. Works of the Spirit which do not renew and save men—The revealer of things connected with the origin, grandeur, and design of the works of God, which man could not discover—His work in relation to the *Man* CHRIST JESUS—The giving of extraordinary power to particular men for special purposes—Direct impartation of knowledge, and the ability to attest the truth—Prophecy, its subjects, range, and all-pervading design—Mission of the apostles, its sanctions, and results—Scripture statements respecting the supernatural endowments of some who were not saved—Effects produced by the belief of the truth ascribed to the Spirit—Exposition of Gen. vi. 3—Views suggested by this, and kindred passages—Importance of the truth respecting this department of the work of the Spirit 65

LECTURE III.

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE SALVATION OF MEN.

I. Testimonies of Scripture respecting this work. Found in prayers, promises, doctrinal statements and allusions, and facts narrated in relation to this work. II. Views suggested by these testimonies—There is the abiding presence of the Spirit in the spirit of man—This fact accounts for the effects produced—The cause of the difference between the believer and him who does not believe—This view in harmony with consciousness—The character of the believer which is the effect of the indwelling Spirit, is the pledge of endless blessedness—The believer prepared by the Spirit for a state of purity and glory. III. Harmony of these truths with other truths known by consciousness or revelation—Does no violence to the freedom and activity of man's spiritual nature—The mind conscious only of its own acts and states—Resistibleness of divine grace considered—This work does not oppose any principle of the moral government of God—Does not destroy the responsibility of man—Feeling of responsibility exists previous to this work—Exists after—Consequences of actions attach to the agents after this work has been experienced—Connexion of this principle with other principles—Grace—Mediation—Harmony of the work of the Spirit with the doctrine of grace—Supremacy, compassion, and righteousness of God displayed—Aspect of the Gospel towards the whole human race—Cause of the acceptance of the blessings of the Gospel—Each illustrates the

	Page
<p>righteousness and grace of God—Harmony of these truths with other truths regarded as mysterious—Some undoubted facts mysterious—Divine existence, creation, miracles—This mysterious fact harmonizes with other facts—The hope that what is now mysterious will be understood in the light of immortality. IV. Facts illustrative of these truths—1st. Men of ancient times acknowledged the need of some such work—Socrates, Xenophon, Plato—Extracts from the dialogues of Plato, Seneca, Marcus Antoninus—2nd. Current strain of Christian literature from the earliest times—Diversity on other points, agreement on this—3rd. There have been pretenders to inspiration, and peculiar sanctity—4th. This is the distinctive characteristic of Christianity</p>	131

LECTURE IV.

CHURCH NOTIONS RESPECTING THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT.

Distinction between the teaching of Scripture respecting spiritual facts, and theological modes of representing them—State of mind requisite for the study of this subject—Gradual departure from the spirituality of the Gospel in the early ages of the church—Causes—Consequences—Impediments to spirituality chiefly within—General ecclesiastical notion on the work of the Spirit—Modifications of this notion held by nearly all branches of the church—This notion seen in the belief that the grace of regeneration is imparted *through* the ministrations of the church, especially in baptism—In the supposed right to possess and impart spiritual blessings, arising out of a federal relation to God—In the peculiar sacredness attached to certain persons and usages—In the power of the rulers of the church to control the actions of its members—In the relation that was believed to exist between the spiritual church, and the civil polity of men, involving spiritual supremacy, legal establishment of churches, tendency to secularize the institutions of the Gospel—Facts opposed to these traditional notions—Per-
vaded by one fundamental error—Not based on man's spiritual nature, nor on those parts of Scripture which fully teach the truth respecting the WORK OF THE SPIRIT—Founded on usage, supported by tradition—Insufficiency of the authority of the Fathers—Testimony of Clement of Rome—Prevailing bias of the writings of the Fathers—Effects of these notions on society—

The source of mischievous controversies—They retard the progress of the Gospel—Grounds of hope for the future—Increased spirituality necessary to a proper appreciation of the excellence of Christianity	Page 200
---	-------------

LECTURE V.

MYSTICISM.

Tendency of extremes to generate their opposites—Formalism—Mysticism—Mysticism defined. I. Speculative mysticism—Its views of the intellectual nature of man—Of the will of God—Of the nature of God—Antiquity and general belief of the doctrine of emanation in the East—Influence of Oriental speculation on the philosophy of the Greeks, and the early Christian writers—Characteristics of the Mystics of the middle ages—Mystics subsequent to the revival of letters—Paracelsus, Boehm, Antoinette Bourignon—Her labours, influence, works—Pierre Poiret, the logical expounder of the principles of mysticism—Modern German mysticism—Coleridge, his mental character, opinions, influence—Summary of his views of Christianity, and the Christian life—Root of mysticism, its views of the spirit of man, the Supreme Spirit, and their relation to each other. II. Contemplative mysticism—Quietists—Madame Guion—Principles of the Quietists—Lord Herbert of Cherbury—His prayer in reference to the publication of his “De Veritate”—Application of the phraseology of Scripture. III. Imaginative mysticism—Explained—Mystical interpretation of the Scriptures—Philo the Jew—Christian writers—Pretensions to new revelations—Emanuel Swedenborg—His learning and talents—Importance of discrimination—Sincerity of some pretenders to revelation—Causes of this delusion. IV. Practical mysticism—Explained—Different modes of manifestation—Peasant war in Germany—Münzer—Ignatius Loyola—Common error attaching to all these forms of mysticism—Mysticism often associated with exalted genius and piety	258
--	-----

LECTURE VI.

THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF SPIRITUAL LIFE IN HARMONY WITH DIVINE
REVELATION.

Page

Different modes and manifestations of life—The <i>cause</i> of spiritual life not known by reasoning or consciousness—Necessity of revelation. I. Testimony of consciousness—The believer conscious of regarding the Gospel as spoken to him by the Spirit—Conscious of thinking rightly—Effect on the emotional part of the nature of the believer—Humility, contrition, gratitude, confidence, patience, love, joy—Conscious of acting rightly—Reason for it found in the Gospel—Conscious of finding encouragement from the Gospel in difficulties arising from his own imperfection—The differing opinions of men—The consciousness of unholy feelings—The Gospel becomes the promise of supernatural aid, which is fulfilled in actual experience—Conscious that from the Gospel he learns to pray—Conscious of finding scope for active sympathy—Conscious that his good dispositions and habits increase in strength. II. Testimony of Scripture—An inward active life—Originating in a distinct act of God.—An act of grace—Wrought by the Spirit—This spiritual life has a relation to the Son of God—Various modes of describing this relation—Christ's relation to his people—Their substitute—Language of Scripture—Christ and his people contrasted with Adam and his posterity—Truths relating to the spiritual life revealed in the Gospel to be apprehended and enjoyed—Experience of the spiritual life, the working of the truth which the mind has believed. III. Theories respecting the spiritual life—1st. Ecclesiastical—Its tendency—Results—2nd. Enthusiastical—Its groundless pretensions—Unnecessary—3rd. Philosophical—Seeming simplicity of this theory—Proceeds on wrong assumptions—Peculiarity of the case of the sinner—Reasonings urged in support of this theory—This theory defective—Fails to account for that without which the Gospel is not believed—Falls short of the simple and forcible statements of Scripture—Involves the subject in confusion and increases rather than relieves the difficulty—The spiritual life, something which has yet to receive a full explanation	308
---	-----

LECTURE VII.

THE MORAL ENERGY OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE.

Page

Distinction between the work of the Spirit and the duty of the believer—Submission to church authority substituted for spiritual religion—Pelagius—Exchange of one extreme for another—The fallacy of Pelagianism consists in adopting the theory of human nature as it ought to be, for human nature *as it is*—Augustine—Connection of Evangelical principles with sound morality. I. The work of the Spirit in renewing the sinner, not essential to the responsibility of man—God the author of good—Calvinian theory of grace supposed to be inconsistent with the strong assertion of the love of God to all mankind, and with the moral judgments of men—Examination of the doctrine of “common grace”—Various manifestations of grace to men which increase the amount of responsibility—Vagueness of the notion of common grace—Texts of Scripture adduced in support of this notion examined. II. The spiritual life the source of the purest morality—It is so in principle—It is so in fact—The design for which the Holy Ghost works in man, includes all that can be included in a moral system—This work adapted to the condition of man as a thinking, self-judging agent—The character to be secured by the Christian system—Importance of the distinctive truths of the Gospel—The high moral tone of apostolic instructions. III. This spiritual life secures results which transcend the aims of ethical philosophy, or of conventional morality—*That* wrought in man, which leads to a right choice, and to right conduct—Man’s obligations confirmed by Christianity—Practical and holy tendency of the principles of the Gospel—Christian perfection considered—Views in which all Evangelical Christians agree—The real question to be determined—Exposition of 1 John iii. 9; v. 18—Progress in holiness—Mistakes in reference to the method of attaining perfect holiness—Views of Scripture. IV. The sum of the whole argument is, the energy of the spiritual life displays the harmonious working of the Spirit of God, and of the spirit of man—Summary of the topics discussed, and the convictions arrived at—Concluding observations 360

APPENDIX.

	Page
A. Scripture terms for Soul and Spirit	399
B. Ancient Distinction between Soul and Spirit	400
C. Freedom of Human Agency	401
D. Scriptures referred to in Lecture II.	402
E. Apparent verbal contradictions in language respecting God . .	405
F. Modern Infidelity	408
G. On the terms Resistible and Irresistible, in application to the work of the Spirit	414
H. On the Laws of Nature	416
I. Plato—Aristotle—Seneca—Marcus Antoninus	418
K. Early Christian Literature	420
L. Clemens Romanus	430
M. Ignatius—Neander—Promises of Scripture referred to in p. 323 .	431
N. On Micah ii. 7, by Dr. Henderson	436
O. Extract from Milton	436
P. On Romans vii.	439
Q. Expositions from Lücke, on 1 John iii. 7—9; v. 16—18 . . .	451
R. Note on Mysticism	459

LECTURE I.

THE CAPACITIES, CONDITION, AND WANTS OF MAN, AS A SPIRITUAL BEING.

It is generally acknowledged by Christians that there is a work of the Spirit of God in the salvation of man. We propose to examine what the Scriptures have taught respecting this work. The whole of that teaching assumes, most obviously, that man possesses a spiritual nature;—that this his spiritual nature is disordered and depraved;—and that the work of the Spirit of God in him is designed to rectify this depravity, and thus to restore his spiritual nature to that condition which is well-pleasing to God.

Our examination of this Christian doctrine, then, begins with those facts to which the doctrine itself refers. We are thus thrown back on the elements of truth. Before reasoning on remote mysteries, we are concerned with our most intimate convictions, our clearest personal knowledge. Having duly pondered man's testimony to his own spiritual nature, and to the present condition of that nature, it will be easy to infer from this testimony

what it is which must be done in him if he is to be restored to righteousness ; and we shall be prepared to receive with meek intelligence the lessons which God himself has given, on the way in which this great want of man is to be supplied.

Our appeal, in this stage of the inquiry, does not lie to books, but to thoughts ; not to opinions that may be derived from others, but to the calm, independent judgment of each man's separate self.

There is no avoiding the belief that our nature is spiritual : every form in which it has been denied implies that it is true. It is involved in every statement which any man can make upon the subject. It is that truth, indeed, which lies under every other truth which we can apprehend. Each of us knows this for himself. By communicating with others, and observing that they act as we do ourselves, we ascribe—we cannot help ascribing—to them a nature similar to that of which we are conscious. All intercourse, instruction, sympathy, appeal, reasoning, and persuasion, are grounded on our indestructible conviction of the spirituality of our common nature. On this conviction all religion is founded ; for it is with the spiritual in man that religion has to do. In man's spirit the Spirit of God works to accomplish his salvation. Assuming, then, this fundamental fact, we proceed to inquire :—

First :—WHAT ARE THOSE SPIRITUAL CAPACITIES AND POWERS WHICH MAN, AS MAN, POSSESSES ?

Secondly :—IN WHAT STATE DO WE NOW FIND

THE SPIRITS OF MEN IN THEIR RELATION TO GOD ?

Thirdly :—WHAT ARE THE WANTS OF THE HUMAN SPIRIT, ARISING FROM ITS BEING IN THIS STATE ?

Fourthly :—IN WHAT WAY ARE WE TAUGHT THAT THOSE WANTS ARE TO BE SUPPLIED ?

FIRST :—WHAT ARE THE CAPACITIES AND POWERS WHICH MAN POSSESSES ?—“ *The spirit of man, which is in him.*”

As we are obliged to use language in the expression of our judgment, it is not irrelevant to consider, how far the *faculty* of language may be justly regarded as a testimony to the working and the power of the human spirit. Language is a system of signs, a vehicle of communication, the stimulus by which one human spirit excites another human spirit to action of its own. The organs of speech and of hearing are, it is true, material; but then they are nothing more than organs: they are used by powers which are not material, and not organic. The same is true of the use of every other medium of communication between man and man. Such, as it seems, is the law of our present condition. We do not now profess to know, positively, of any direct communication of one human spirit with another. There may be a sympathy, an intuition, a reciprocation of affection, lying too deep for language, and too subtile and spiritual for expression by material signs. There is nothing absurd in such a supposition. It cannot be shown to be impossible; yet we pretend not to be

in possession of indubitable facts, in sufficient number, to warrant us in saying that such a direct spiritual communication exists. Our definition of language might comprise whatever means are used to address or move the inward man through the outward senses; yet it is to articulated speech, to the written signs of thought, and to the conventional symbols of science, that we refer as illustrating the unseen workings of the spirit. When we use language, in this comprehensive application of the term, we are conscious of processes totally different from the processes of speech, or of writing; and when we hear or see the words of others, we have an irresistible persuasion that, in like manner, they are going through a spiritual process which our own consciousness enables us to understand. Thus, this world of outward signals becomes the manifold organ of another world of inward activity: filled with the shadows of the unseen, the utterances of the inaudible, the material signs of the spiritual.

In the higher forms of language, the indications of spiritual activity become more delicate; and from this very delicacy they become stronger, because they are removed farther from familiar association with the external causes of bodily sensation.

The entire language relating to thought, emotion, abstract truth, moral judgments, and spiritual conditions, is a proof that the inward spirit is capable of doing that to which what is not spiritual bears

no resemblance, and of which the most purified terms and phrases are felt to be but imperfect and inadequate exponents. Every man does this; and he does it the more as he rises from infancy to manhood, or from the rudeness of the savage to the culture of civilisation. To beings unconscious of thought, emotion, choice, ratiocination, and spiritual activity, the language used for these purposes would be utterly unintelligible. Because we are conscious of them, such language has been invented, and is used: and by this consciousness we are able to understand it—that is, we are brought to think the thoughts of which such language is the signification.

Allow me, for one moment, to advert to the words most common in our language as the signs of human personality. There is the simple pronoun “I,” with its objective “me.” What is meant by this? You at once understand it. You know that *you* think, feel, act; that these things are done by yourself. You express this when you say, I think, I feel, I act. It is the sign of one’s own conscious self; that which is peculiar to each—that which is the person—the man. When a man speaks of his eye, his ear, his hand, he feels that not any of these is his own self, but that they belong to him, and that they are used by him, just as he uses a telescope, or a trumpet. We speak of the *mind*. The mind is the man thinking, attending, remembering, imagining, judging, reasoning. We speak of the *soul*. The soul is the man living,

feeling, enjoying, grieving. We speak of the *spirit*. The spirit is the man *acting freely* and from choice; the principle of action; the habitual tone; the predominant character. Such words are commonly understood. Their meaning is well defined. They can be used interchangeably; or they can be used with distinctive applications. They signify that which every man knows. They relate to "the things of a man" which can be known only by the "spirit of man which is in him."*

There was, in ancient times, a distinction made between the *soul* and the *spirit*; and to this distinction there are allusions in the language of the apostle Paul. In 1 Thess. v. 23, he says, "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I *pray God* your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." We observe a similar distinction in the Epistle to the Hebrews. "For the word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of the soul and spirit." (iv. 12.) It is well known that this mode of distinguishing the spirit from the soul in man was common to several of the Grecian schools; it might, therefore, be the ordinary mode of thinking on this subject among the Thessalonians, at the time when the apostle wrote to them. It was likewise adopted, in all probability, by the Rabbins; if so, it would be familiar to the Hebrews. It is

* Appendix, Note A.

not surprising that there should be traces of the same distinction among the early writers of the Christian church.* So far as we can comprehend this distinction, it would appear to represent the *soul* as the subject of those sensations, emotions, appetites, and passions, which are occasioned and acted on by the condition of the body; and the *spirit*, as the rational, free, and active principle, in which consists the image of God. It is probable that little, if anything, more was meant by these distinctions than what is meant, in modern times, when we speak of the affections as distinguishable from the reason, the will, and the conscience.

Another distinction, peculiar to the New Testament, is made between the “natural man,” and the “spiritual man.” The natural man, as we understand the apostle, *ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος*, is simply man without the Spirit of God, as the Revealer of truth; while the *spiritual* man, *πνευματικός*, is he who, like the apostles and other inspired teachers, was endowed with the Holy Spirit for the purpose of apprehending and teaching the doctrines which, without that endowment, could not be known.

I. *The great fundamental fact in relation to the human mind, soul, or spirit, is CONSCIOUSNESS.*

Each man knows “the things” of himself, by his “own spirit which is in him.” Whether we speak in popular language, or aim at philosophical

* See Note B.

precision, this is the account we have to render. It is a fact. It is direct and spontaneous knowledge. It is universal. We cannot conceive of ourselves, or of men, as being without it. It is our very nature. Men may differ in their power of attending to this fact. But no man can doubt that so it is. No man can escape from this conviction. It is not so much a faculty or power in man as the essential element in which what we speak of as a faculty or a power *is*. To know, is to be conscious of knowing; to think, is to be conscious of thinking; to feel, is to be conscious of feeling; to act, is to be conscious of acting. So to be conscious is a spiritual attribute. It is not anything that can be weighed or measured. It is not a combination of parts. Neither is it a mere word for expressing an abstract notion. It is not the result of any process, the conclusion from any premises. It is that which we know of ourselves, which we always know, which we cannot but know, yet of which we cannot explain how it is that we do know it, otherwise than by saying, so it is. We cannot go deeper. We cannot reach anything more simple, or more obvious. Our belief of it is clear, unquestioning, irresistible. He who would say in words, "I am not conscious, I do not know that I have any knowledge, or any feeling, or any capacity for action," would be using terms which really prove what he seemingly denies. He who would affect to doubt whether his consciousness be true, would be trifling with consciousness, with truth, with language, with

himself, with man, and with God. To attempt to prove, or disprove, anything of which a man is conscious, is a bare absurdity ; for all proving must rest on consciousness ; it is itself the basis, the principle, the beginning of all knowledge.

We have said that men may differ in their power of attending to consciousness. It is easier for many persons to think of the world without them, than of the man within. It is the habit of the greater part of mankind to be more conversant with things than with thoughts ; with the objects which engage their minds, than with their minds themselves ; and the prevalence of this habit is one of the many reasons why even Christianity has come to be considered rather as a history, or a creed, or an external institution, than as that inward life of which the Christian is assured by his own consciousness. Christianity, indeed, has its history, its doctrines, and its formal institutions. That history is full of interest, and its monuments are glorious ; those doctrines are plainly revealed, and the belief of them is built on the clearest reasons ; those institutions are simple, authoritative, and of the highest practical importance ; but *Christianity itself is an affair of consciousness*. It belongs to the domain of the spiritual. It is a hidden life. It is that which a man *is* ; and which, therefore, is the ground and reason of his thinking and acting as he does. Men may compare the human spirit to a mirror, to a musical chord, to a machine, or to anything by which they fancy they can shadow

forth its workings; yet it is neither a machine, a musical chord, nor a mirror; it is a spirit, a conscious being.—This spirit is related to what is not spiritual. We know that it is so related; but we cannot explain the relation. The fact that the “spirit of man which is in him” acts upon the things which are not in him, and is acted upon by them, is plain; *how* this takes place is not plain. We are conscious of seeing, and we are conscious of muscular motion. We can have no doubt that we see, or that we move, the things that are not within us. Though it is merely of our own acts, or our own feelings, that we are conscious, our consciousness of such acts and feelings is accompanied by an inevitable belief that what we see or move is something separate from ourselves, and independent of our feelings or our actions: so that it is a simple record of a fact to say, I hear a sound, I see a hand, I feel a motion. As we are conscious of hearing, seeing, and feeling, so are we conscious of giving signs of what we think or feel, and of receiving signs of similar thoughts and feelings from beings like ourselves. As sure as we are that we express our own meaning, so sure are we that others express their meaning in like manner. We can have no doubt that we thus hold communion with beings like ourselves. Thus, indeed, we commune with the “Father of spirits.” We see Him with the spirit’s eye, while with the body’s eye we look upon His works, and think *whose* works they are, and

wherefore He has made them. We hear Him with our spirit's ear, while with the body's ear we listen to His words, remembering whose words they are, and duly pondering wherefore He has uttered or recorded them. Whether there is a higher communion than that of mediate signs between one human being and another—a deep, unutterable sympathy—we leave to each man's consciousness. That there can be, may be, and often is, direct and ineffable communion between a Christian and his God, we see no reason, and we have no desire, to doubt. “What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?”

II. We are conscious of INTELLIGENCE—of the capacity of knowing; of the desire to know; and of knowledge actually acquired.

The sphere of our possible knowledge has no bounds that we can assign. We feel capable of knowing everything. We desire to know whatever it is possible for us to know. The acquisition of knowledge in different persons, or in the same person at different times, may be steady, or it may be interrupted; it may be rapid, or it may be slow; it may be vigorous, or it may be languid; it may be in harmony with our other spiritual capacities, or it may violate that harmony by relative defect, or relative excess, or by a direction which is unwise and evil;—but on the whole, our entire life is spent in actually acquiring knowledge, in perceiving and comparing things, in building up

what is, or seems to be, a world within, corresponding with the world without.

Of this intelligence we are conscious; we know that we are doing that which is in its nature spiritual. It belongs to this spiritual attribute to concern itself with what is true, or beautiful, or good, or right. To think that which is true, and to enjoy it *as* true, is one of the manifest ends of our being as we are; as manifest as it is that the eye was made for light, or the hand for motion.

We have the foundations of all truth in the infallible certainties of our own consciousness; and it is by building on these foundations—following the guidance of these indubitable principles—that we turn to account all observation, testimony, and reasoning, in our progress towards all the truth which we shall ever grasp.

Men fall into error by speculating when they ought to observe; by believing when they ought to judge; by imagining when they ought to reason; and by reasoning when they ought to believe. But there is no law of our nature which *compels* us to err in any of these matters; on the contrary, we can err only by violating the law by which our Creator teaches us that we should be ruled.

III. As we are formed for thinking or knowing the true, so are we formed for ADMIRING AND ENJOYING THE BEAUTIFUL.

This is one of the modifications of intelligence, accompanied by a sense of special gratification. As men err in the pursuit of the true, so like-

wise do they err in their admiration of the beautiful, by perverted tastes, by inaccurate judgments, and by false standards; but all such errors are violations of the one law which requires that our inward apprehensions should conform to reality, to the truth of things as they are, and as they are regarded by the perfect mind of God. The material universe is filled with beautiful forms, colours, tastes, sounds, odours, movements, and combinations; to perceive and to enjoy these beauties severally, and in harmony, to remember them, to arrange them in new and diverse combinations, and to trace in them the developments of that creating Spirit which is the standard and the fountain of all beauty, are amongst the highest and most delightful attributes of our spiritual nature. And the dominion of the beautiful extends beyond the sphere of the senses; for there is sprightliness of thought—ingenuity of contrivance—skilfulness of reasoning—sublimity of purpose—delicacy of sentiment—elegance of expression—grandeur of imagination—dignity of action—all of which appeal to our perception and admiration of the beautiful in mind.

IV. *Not less are we formed for* APPREHENDING, APPROVING, *and* CHOOSING THAT WHICH IS RIGHT.

We are as conscious of our moral, as we are of our intellectual, constitution. The distinction between the right and the wrong is as fundamental as the distinction between the true and the false. The will of Him who made us, must be right for us; other-

wise, it would not be His will. We know that it must be right, since He wills it. We owe it, then, to Him, whose we are, and whom we serve, to do that which is right. This right-doing is our own doing, that which we freely choose, and heartily approve, and which we do because we have freely chosen, and heartily approved it. We know His will in this matter from the constitution of our own nature. It is as natural for man, —*as man*—to distinguish the right from the wrong, to approve the right and condemn the wrong, as it is to discriminate the true from the false, to adopt the true, and reject the false. When we say that this is natural to man, *as man*—we mean, that this is the manifest design of the moral constitution with which his Creator has endowed him; and that the opposite, that is, the neglect of discriminating the right from the wrong, or the doing of what he cannot but inwardly disapprove as wrong, is a violation of his nature; that is to say, it is *unnatural*, *disorderly*, *sinful*; and, therefore, *hateful* to God. We shall have occasion, hereafter, to deal with the fact that there is such disorder; and to show that this disorder is a violation of human nature, exhibiting that nature in a depraved state; but all that we are at present concerned with is, to appeal to man's consciousness of being so made as to show the end for which he was made,—and so made, also, that he cannot secure that end but by obeying the law of his nature, which is, that he should choose, and do, only what is right. That men make

mistakes as to *what* particular action is right, that they set up false standards, act from various evil motives, and commit sin, is universally acknowledged; but, surely, no thoughtful man will say, that human nature has been *intentionally constituted* with a view to such results as these. If, then, human nature has not been intentionally constituted so as to produce results which are wrong, we are supported by all reasoning from the wisdom and goodness of God, by all the analogies of our corporeal and intellectual nature, by our inward consciousness, and by appeals—both to the history of man, and to the word of God—in affirming that he who acts according to the moral constitution of his nature acts as his Maker intended he should act, and therefore he is right.

Then what is that moral constitution of which we are conscious? For a satisfactory answer to this question, we must advert, first of all, to some particular facts of which we were separately conscious at different times; and then, we must so combine these facts as to bring out the general truth of which we may be said to be conscious at all times.

(1.) We are conscious of *free* and *voluntary action*. There are many things which we do, simply because we choose to do them; and we choose to do them because the doing of them is agreeable to us, or seems to be directly or remotely for our own advantage, or for the pleasure and advantage of others. These, and only these,

are our own acts. We are not compelled to them by any cause external to ourselves, not by any irresistible necessity or fatality. It is as much our nature thus to act, as it is our nature to know or to judge. But we act with intelligence. Our intelligent action is according to the views which our disposition, our spirit, our prevailing habit of thought and feeling, prepares us to take of each particular voluntary act.*

(2.) We are conscious of particular desires or *affections* prompting us to act. These are motives. They are incitements to act, not action. They are the occasions, not the necessary causes, of our action. We *act*, and are not merely acted upon. The free mind acts according to its own nature, its entire nature, and not according to anything less than the whole. It is not the freedom of chance, nor of caprice, but of deliberation and of order. Whatever impulses there may be in the appetites or passions, the acts of the free mind are guided by its own reason, and by its own sense of what is wise and good.

(3.) We are conscious of regarding some actions as wise and good, because they are *right*. Whatever our standard of right may be, from whence soever our notions of right may be derived, and whatever degree of attention we pay, whether more or less, to such a mode of looking at our actions, we are conscious that it belongs to our nature to

* See Note C.

HAVE a standard of right, and to judge of our actions according to that standard. It is natural to us to make the will of a superior our standard, the will of a parent, a teacher, a magistrate, a community, and, ultimately and supremely, the will of our Creator, in whatever way that will may be expressed.

(4.) We are conscious of *judging* ourselves—invariably and authoritatively judging ourselves for our own acts. We approve when they are right; we condemn when they are wrong. When we thus approve, we look on our own actions with a special kind of pleasure, or complacency. When we thus condemn, we look on our own actions with shame and self-reproach. Such judgments are ascribed to CONSCIENCE. The feelings consequent upon them are called MORAL FEELINGS. It is possible for men to act without heeding the judgments of conscience, and thus to escape the bitterness of self-reproach; even the wilful habit of so doing is but too easily formed, and too generally maintained. But it must be clear to every person of serious reflection, that so to act at all—still more, so to act habitually, is to act against the highest law of our spiritual nature, and consequently, against the will of Him who created us. He who thinks, for but one calm moment, on his own course, finds *that within him* which condemns him for so doing, and which covers him with shame in his own sight, as well as in the sight of God.

From these separate facts, we derive the general truth, that we are conscious of having a moral con-

stitution—a constitution which makes us accountable to God for the moral character, the right or the wrong, of every action of our lives ; a constitution by which we are self-condemned, and also condemned by the supreme Judge, for every wrong we do. To act according to this constitution is so to act as to keep every impulse in subordination to the conscience ; and so to think of right and wrong as to have the conscience regulated by the known will of God.

It is a question of speculation, for the most part, whether the will of God respecting our free actions can be gathered from the moral constitution of which we are conscious ; the truth is, that we are so familiar with the specific declarations of the will of God in his revelation, that it must be difficult in all cases, and it may in some cases be impossible, to discern the sources, to analyze the rudiments, and to trace the natural history of our moral judgments. But as a practical question, bearing more widely than most other questions on the character and prospects of human beings, we are not at liberty to shrink from avowing our conviction, together with the reason why we hold it. Our conviction is—that every man *may* know what is right, by reflecting on his own conscious moral nature. No man can conclude from what he knows, or may know of his own nature, that it is a matter of indifference to him whether he does right or wrong ; or that it is right to follow the impulse of every appetite or affection.

Every man must conclude that his nature lays him under an obligation to follow the judgments of his conscience. No man's conscience sanctions his doing that which he would condemn if done by another, nor his inflicting what he knows to be an injury, either on himself, or on any of his fellow-creatures, nor his acting in any way which is unworthy of an intelligent, rational, and moral agent. All men, invariably, acknowledge that right *ought* to be done. All men, so far as we know, approve, naturally, of what they regard as truth, temperance, benevolence, justice, and obedience to the supreme authority. Now "*where there is no law there is no transgression.*" Where there is transgression, therefore, there *is* a law. Either men are not sinners, any further than they have an outward law; or, independently of an outward law, "every man is a law unto himself." To commit sin is to violate a known law. All men are charged with sin; and the charge appeals to the personal conscience of each man. Every man's conscience, therefore, is appealed to for the fact that man has done what he knew to be wrong—wrong, because in so doing he transgressed what he knew to be a law to him. If this holds good of any man, it holds good of every man. Whether or not man is acquainted with an outward law, given by immediate revelation, or by a revelation committed to either oral or written tradition, he is placed under the clear and intelligible law of his own moral constitution, and he is bound by that law. The

revealed law appeals to the primeval and natural law ; founds upon it ; harmonizes with it ; adding clearness to its requirements, and solemnity to its sanctions.

The law of our moral constitution, it is most certain, *can* give no information of the way of deliverance from the consequences of violating its requirements ; neither does the revealed law : though the writing which contains the revealed law contains also the promise of redemption, instructs us in the duties arising out of the new relations to God and to each other in which the redemption places us, and unfolds an entirely new class of motives to obedience.

There could scarcely be a grosser error than to maintain that the moral constitution of man suffices to teach us *all* that is right, now that we are placed under a redeeming economy. To maintain such a notion, is to deny the fact that man has sinned ; to reject the salvation which Divine grace has revealed ; to live in woeful ignorance of all that most nearly concerns us, in our present fallen state, to know ; and perversely to neglect all that is required of us to be or to do for the recovery of the happiness we have forfeited and lost by sin. But our sin is, in the first instance, the violation of the law of our own moral constitution, whether our knowledge of that law comes from reflecting on our consciousness within, or from the revelation of the will of God without.

V. We are conscious of GOOD or EVIL, of well-being or ill-being : and it is our nature to seek the

one and to avoid the other. The mental desires occasioned by the corporeal appetites have their appropriate objects ; the gratification of such desires is, in itself, good ; and the disappointment of such desires is, in itself, evil. But, according to the constitution of human nature, these lower gratifications are intended to subserve our enjoyment of higher good ; and we are endowed with reason and with conscience for the express purpose of maintaining the mastery of the higher propensions. In pursuing truth, we are required to forego some of the pleasures connected with the senses ; and in the fulfilment of moral duty we are, in like manner and equally, required to give up some of the gratifications of the intellectual tastes. As the satisfaction we enjoy in perceiving the true and the beautiful is of a higher order than any kind of sensual indulgence ; so the self-approbation of doing what is right, the blessedness of pleasing God, is higher still, and must be chosen rather than merely intellectual delight ; so that the path of self-control and self-denial is the only path on earth that leads to the highest felicity. To the sensualist, it is misery to be thwarted in the gratification of the appetites. To the intellectual, it is misery to be hindered in the pursuit of knowledge. To the moral, it is misery to neglect the doing of what is right. The merely sensual have no conception of the habitudes of the intellectual. The merely intellectual have no conception of the habitudes of the moral. The moral are they who rise

above the intellectual, as the intellectual are they who rise above the sensual. He who seeks his well-being according to the laws of his nature is not without the lower appetites; but he keeps them in their place by the guidance of his reason. Neither is he without the intellectual tendencies; but these, too, are kept in their place by the authority of his conscience. From this height, where he fulfils the noblest functions of his nature, he may rise to unmeasured degrees of the sublimest good. He loves himself. He loves his neighbour. He loves God above all. Then his own delight in the consciousness of fulfilling the law of his nature is enlarged by the sympathy of all virtuous beings; and the love of God, which is unutterable, fills him full of joy.

Such is our Spiritual Nature. These are the "things of a man" which are known by the "spirit of a man which is in him." These are his capacities. They belong to every man. Were the law of this nature obeyed freely, heartily, constantly and universally, where would be the darkness of ignorance? Where would be the perversion of taste? Where would be the bondage of sin? Where would be the wail of misery? In such a nature we see the likeness of God. Who could be its author, but he who knows all things, who is the Original of all Beauty, whose Goodness is perfect, and whose Blessedness is for evermore? Why should HE create such a being as man knows himself to be, but that he might be a partaker of

the Divine felicity, to irradiate the universe with his Creator's glory?

Our Second Inquiry is,—In WHAT STATE DO WE NOW FIND THE SPIRIT OF MAN, IN HIS RELATION TO GOD?

The appeal here lies still to consciousness, to each man's own self. The facts of which we are conscious lead us to form a similar judgment of other men, when their outward life resembles the outward life resulting from that of which we are conscious in ourselves. It is to this separate and collective consciousness—not to the Divine Omniscience alone—that the inspired teachers make their appeal, when they challenge each man, and denounce all men, as guilty of sin in the presence of the heart-searching God.

We need no elaborate inquiry for coming to a just apprehension of the spiritual condition of man, as we now find him, and as all history and tradition show him to have been in time past. It is not, however, as a theological dogma—it is as a *historical summation of facts*, that we are now to treat this question. First of all, then, it is put to each man's consciousness, whether he is, or has ever been, all that he knows he ought to have been, in thought, in motive, in speech, in act, in every social relation; and whether, in the entire course of his spiritual recollections, he has aimed uniformly, undeviatingly, cheerfully, entirely, at pleasing God, always giving up his own way to what he knew to be the will of Him who made him? He whose

heart cannot calmly and truly say, *Yes*, to such searching questions, is a witness for God against himself; and he knows that, so far as he is personally concerned, the challenge of inspiration is well founded, and God's condemnation of him is beyond all doubt. Then, secondly, what is the judgment which men form of other men—not in the heat of passion, or in the gloom of theological dogmatism, or the exaggerations of poetry and eloquence, but in those cool and serene moments when, if ever, the mind is guided by evidence, and reposes only on truth? It is for each thoughtful person—none else are invited to this inquiry, or are, indeed, capable of pursuing it—to ponder on the view which his experience of mankind, his practical observations, his reading, his knowledge of human nature—however acquired—has led him to form of the actual condition of his fellow-creatures as they are related, in the same way in which he is himself related, to the Supreme Being. We need not now repair to the haunts of vice, or the homes of misery; to the outcasts from civilization and virtuous society; to the innumerable registers of woe which are written in tears and blood on broken hearts; to the strifes and frauds of social competition; to the monuments of political rancour; to the fields of war; to the chains and brands of slavery; to the den of the robber, or the murderer's cell: though these frightful scenes, it will be remembered, exhibit too large a proportion of the actual doings of men to be omitted by one who

would look on human nature as it positively is, and as it has really been. All this is sufficiently plain to any one who honestly considers what his own inward spirit must be, were his outward life such as he has reason to believe to have been, and still to be, the outward life of innumerable men. He cannot but conclude that there is a fearful amount of human wrong-doing to be dealt with in the righteous judgments of the future world.

But beyond the relations of man to his fellow-man, which are of course included in the comprehensive relation of each man to his Creator—we are considering, more specially, that first, closest, most constant of all relations, the sacred and endless relation which each human spirit bears to God, and to God alone. *What has MAN'S RELIGION been?* And how has he dealt with that religion? There are some views of the history of Man's Religion, and of his mode of dealing with religion, or rather with God, the Being with whom religion has to do, which will at once illustrate the pertinency of this question to our present inquiry, and guide us to its true solution.

1. Man has chosen the MATERIAL IN RELIGION RATHER THAN THE SPIRITUAL. The spiritual nature of man is as clear a proof of the spirituality of God, as any fact or series of facts can be of the wisdom and power of God. It is to none other than to a God who is conscious, intelligent, free, good, and blessed, that we are led, either by the most vulgar conclusions from what we see around us, by

the careful inductions of scientific observation, or by the most abstruse metaphysical reasonings. It is the spiritual in ourselves that plans contrivances, forms designs, and conceives of the beautiful, the wise, the beneficent, in action; and it is by our spirit's power, its knowledge, and its will, that we produce the material results that are visible in our works. To reverence that which is inferior, infinitely inferior, to ourselves; to rely on it; to seek our good in it; to think of it as at all capable, in itself, of helping us, or in any sense or in any degree fit to receive religious regard, divine adoration and honour, is to revolt the most primitive, abiding, and universal consciousness of our intellectual and moral nature: so to revolt it, that if it were put to us to say, whether it be possible for man, in the possession of the spiritual faculties which we feel to be essential to man, to think and act in a way so grossly absurd, we should all say, It is not possible: and possible it is not, so long as man makes that use of his spiritual faculties to which they are adapted and proportioned, and for the sake of which he has been endowed with them. But how does the fact stand? Has not idolatry in its grossest forms—not symbolism merely, but real idolatry, in the broadest and plainest sense of the word—been the stain and reproach of every family of the human race? And for one spiritual worshipper of Him who “is a Spirit,” who would venture to calculate how many idolaters are, this day, bowing down to the work of men's hands, in

the belief, and with the feeling, that these things are gods? And leaving the dark range of idolatry, what means the ever-recurring symbolism, the parent of idolatry, and its survivor, to which men cling, even after they have read the Bible? How is it to be accounted for, that men are not content with the spiritual in religion?—that they will have the senses touched, and the imagination regaled, in temples?—that they are so eager to embody the spiritual, to paint the unseen, to enshrine the Infinite?—that they are so prone to make religion to consist in gestures, processions, music, incense, vestments, lights, and shadows; in fastings, alms, and prayers; in grand organizations; in visible gauds and pomps? Account for all this as we may, there it has been always, and there it is, wherever man is, at this hour. Religion is reverence of man's spirit for God; his love to Him; his communion with Him; and whatever be the value of temples, and of bodily services, he who has not the spiritual affections of which outward service seems to be the token, may have been amused, may have been delighted, and may be flattered into imagining that he has worshipped God; but he—that is the man, the conscious, intelligent, spiritual being—has not been doing anything that even in the least degree resembles worship. This preference of the material to the spiritual is a degradation of man; it does dishonour to his nature; it violates the law of his being; it proves him to be in love with disorder, and, there-

fore, depraved in that which relates to his highest powers and his noblest occupation.

2. *Man has chosen the FALSE IN RELIGION RATHER THAN THE TRUE.* It never was true, never can be true, that the innumerable objects of man's worship are capable of receiving, or worthy of receiving, the adoration which he presents to them. He has "changed the truth concerning God into a lie." Not only has he thus dealt with the knowledge of God which he might have drawn from without, and from within, but, after a revelation was addressed to him from heaven, and avowedly received by him and acknowledged as Divine, he "abode not in the truth." The revelation itself has been mimicked and superseded by false and spurious revelations. Pretended miracles, false prophets, teachers of lies, doctrines the most absurd, and usages the most impure and inhuman, have swayed the thoughts and formed the characters of unnumbered millions. And the religions of the world have been popular and commanding very much in proportion, not to the *truth*, but to the *falsehood*, which they embody. Consult the Pagan histories, or the Jewish, or the Mohammedan, or the Christian, and you have the sad conviction forced upon you that, with one consent, the human race have "loved darkness rather than light," have followed "lying wonders," have not "received the love of the truth that they might be saved," have "believed a lie," and "believed not the truth." This inveterate love of the false in religion has not

been occasioned by ignorance, but by a dislike to retain knowledge. It has been displayed by the enlightened few as well as by the unlettered many; nay, it has been perpetuated among the many by the authority and influence of the few. It is less the companion of rudeness than the child of ingenuity. It is not the wisdom of the foolish so much as it is the folly of the wise. Religious truth has had to struggle and to fight. Her champions have been confessors and martyrs. She has found her enemies in philosophies and in priesthoods, in the palaces of kings, and in the halls of parliaments; in the gardens of pleasure, and in the marts of trade; among the crouching slaves of despotism, and among the brave and proud and free; in the lonely thinker of the cloister, and in the giddy crowd; under the bright sky of youth, and under the wintry clouds of age; in the mighty throb of life, and in the cold silence of approaching death; in every age; in every land; in every grade of existence; under every form of government; in all varieties of temperament; in every known aspect of humanity: while falsehood, religious falsehood, on the other hand, in the very same conditions of the same humanity, finds willing disciples, and gathers whole generations into her train. "The light shined in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not." Of the world, we may say, as the prophet was commissioned to say of the holy city, "Run ye to and fro through the streets of Jerusalem, and see now, and know, and

seek in the broad places thereof, if ye can find a man, if there be any that seeketh the truth; and I will pardon it. Truth is perished, and cut off from their mouth." To mankind indiscriminately, while doing according to their own cherished desires, we may apply the strong language of the New Testament, "they do not obey the truth," "they are destitute of the truth;" "concerning the truth they have erred;" "they walk in darkness, and do not the truth; the truth is not in them." They deliberately adopt what is new, or what is old; what is familiar, or what is fashionable; what is respectable, or profitable; what is agreeable, or easy; what is commended to them by the zeal of advocates, or imposed on them by the authority of teachers or rulers; but where is he whose entire soul is bent on knowing, and on holding fast, at all hazards, that which is true? Now when we look calmly at this universal choice of the false rather than the true in religion, we shall have a strong conviction that God did not intend man for this; did not make him for this; that the condition in which we thus find man to be is the very reverse of that which it was designed that he should be; and that, consequently, it is a derangement, a disturbance, a depravation, a voluntary, that is, a chosen depravation of man's spiritual nature.

3. *Man chooses the* SPECULATIVE IN RELIGION, RATHER THAN THE PRACTICAL. The entire constitution of our spiritual faculties proves to us that we are made for action, for right action, for acting

rightly towards God ; and that our ability to distinguish things that differ, so as to reason from one truth to another truth, has been given to us for the purpose of guiding us in such a practical course of living as shall fulfil the end of our creation. But it has come to pass that men have treated religion as a theme rather than as a life ; as something to be looked at, rather than as *the one thing to be done* ; as an affair of reasoning and disputation, not as an affair of personal and uniform obedience to a wise and good and authoritative law. It is to this speculating tendency that an inspired apostle traces, in part, the origin of idolatry, and of all the corruptions which have marred the beauty, and destroyed the power, of true religion. “ For these invisible things, even His eternal power and Godhead, since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made ; so that they are inexcusable, because though they knew God, they did not glorify Him as God, neither gave Him thanks ; but became foolish by their own reasonings ; and their inconsiderate heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools.”*

Against this tendency he sounds the earnest warning, “ Beware lest any man spoil you through an empty and deceitful philosophy, after the traditions of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ ; intruding into things which

* Rom. i. 20—22.

he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind.”* It was against this pride and self-sufficiency and speculative vanity in man that the ambassadors of Christ were sent with the artillery of divine truth—“For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent. Where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is the disputer of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?”† “For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty in God for the overturning of strong holds, overturning reasonings (*λογισμοὺς*) and every high thing raised up against the knowledge of God, and leading captive every thought to the obedience of Christ.”‡ In a high strain of practical earnestness an apostle condemns “vain jangling, profane and old wives’ fables—not consenting to wholesome words; the ignorant pride which dotes on questions and strifes of words; the perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness; vain babblings; and oppositions of science falsely so called; striving about words to no profit, to the subverting of the hearers; foolish and unlearned questions which do gender strife; ever learning and never coming to a knowledge of the truth, deceiving and being deceived; having itching ears; turned from the truth to fables; unruly and vain talkers, whose mouths must be stopped; command-

* Col. ii. 8—18.

† 1 Cor. i. 18—25.

‡ 2 Cor. x. 4, 5.

ments of men, that turn from the truth." The propensity thus uniformly denounced may be detected more or less by every one who fairly examines his own spirit, and honestly recalls to mind the frequent instances in which opinions have had more charm than duties, and obedience has been forgotten in the heat of disputation. The exaggeration of this temper is bigotry. Its rage is persecution. Its personal characteristics are conceit and narrow-mindedness. Its social form is seen in the sectary of every name, in the combatant of every church. Unhappily the speculative is not merely preferred to the practical. The one is often directly and purposely opposed to the other. Not seldom is speculation made to occupy the place of the practical; the merely intellectual mode of looking at religion is substituted, perhaps mistaken, for religion itself. Under the veil of concern for truth how often has justice been trampled in the mire, and charity torn to pieces! Men have made laws for human thought, and forged chains for the free spirit. A cold monotony of opinion has been sacrilegiously baptized with the name of faith; while love has been driven from her own temple. Mechanism is expected to perform the functions of life. Instead of the devotion of a purified and happy spirit, offering itself as a living sacrifice to God, the scared and trembling dupe of an unexamined creed is dragged to an altar which it loathes, by men whose only bond of union and whose only principle of action is a shadow and a name. On the other hand, we see the

licentiousness of endless questioning. The verities of religion are abstracted from their vital association with conscience, and character, and happiness ; and mooted, as questions of vulgar strife, on the arena of sceptical debate. *He* assumes to have the clearest intellect who has the least religious belief. Evidence, divine authority, practical worth, are set at nought by the pedantry which arrogates to itself the name of learning, or by a logic which proudly struts before us in the mantle of philosophy. All positive judgments concerning religion are rejected as alike unfounded, or tolerated as equally indifferent. So it is that one extreme generates another. The bigot and the sceptic, the persecutor and the latitudinarian, start in opposite directions from the same centre ; and the cause of their perpetual quarrel lies in the one element which is common to them all,—the preference of the speculative to the practical. Is it necessary to say that such a preference does violence to the fundamental laws of human nature ; that it is destructive of religion ; that it dishonours God ; that it is a deadly evil ? It is itself a proof that man has gone astray from the right path, that he has lost the simplicity of innocence, the habit of obedience, the love of doing that for which his spiritual nature has been fitted, and in which alone he can find his dignity or his happiness.

4. *Man chooses the* SENTIMENTAL IN RELIGION RATHER THAN THE MORAL. Religion is the right condition and the right action of our spiritual nature. It embraces the whole man. It lights up

the intellect with truth. It adorns the imagination with beauty. It enthrones the conscience. It raises and purifies the affections. It consecrates the life to God. The moral in religion is the ultimate ; for to the formation of a perfect character, all thought, feeling, and action are subordinate. Sentiment can be religious no farther than as it is guided by divine truth, and not otherwise than as it prompts to holy living. Now, as there is a large amount of speculative thinking concerning religion, which is liked better than religion itself, and is often made to usurp the place of religion, so, too, there is a large amount of feeling usually suggested by religion, and accompanying religion, which is liked better than religion itself, and which is also made to usurp the place of religion. We are not required to separate religion from its appropriate external signs ; but we are to take heed that the external signs are not so exclusively or so prominently regarded as to neglect the spiritual principle. We need not discourage thought, discrimination, reasoning, settled judgment, and belief, respecting religious truth ; though we are warned against confounding bare speculation with religion, and allowing it to take the place of practice. In the same way, and for the same reason, while we cannot conceive of religion otherwise than as affecting the sensibilities of our nature, we must denounce the religion which is confined to the feelings as utterly spurious ; and we must describe that religion in which the affections are cultivated, to the neglect

of the conscience, as seriously defective. There is much in the sentimental capacities of our nature which can be easily gratified ; and there is a passive kind of indulgence in such gratification which is among the most bewitching pleasures of human existence. Such gratifications, it is well known, are enjoyed in occupations which no man pretends to regard as religious. Exactly the same kinds of gratification are enjoyed in occupations which are regarded by the common consent of mankind as religious occupations. The danger lies, then, in supposing that all the emotions which are connected with services professedly religious, are religious emotions ; and in considering the experience of such emotions as evidences of a religious mind, without pausing to remember *what* has moved the feelings, or waiting to observe the fruit of such feelings in a man's practical life. If the feelings are moved by causes which are no part of religion, and if, consequently, they produce no religious improvement in the character, then, whatever they are, strong or weak, good or bad, painful or pleasing, most assuredly they are *not* religious feelings. Even when the thoughts that move the mind are sacred, and the effects secured by them are holy, the bare excitement of such emotions may come to be liked *for its own sake*, rather than for the sake of that elevation and strength of the spiritual life which they may promote : in this case, though we cannot condemn them as spurious, people must be placed upon their guard against preferring the passing

emotion to the permanent improvement, and thus sliding into the delusive sentimentality which neither comes from heaven, nor prepares men for it.

We need not wander far, nor long, for proofs that the sentimental in religion is chosen in preference to the moral. The materialism of false religions has its whole power in the fact that such preference is congenial to the present state of human nature. The sculpture which entranced or awed ; the mystic sounds and shadows ; the rites that filled the heart with terror or with hope ; the grove, the fane, the altar, the festival, the sacrifice, the procession ; while they subdued or stimulated the outward sense, wrought through the imagination on the deepest feelings of mankind, and made them the slaves of priests or rulers. The patriotism of the Hebrew, as he mounted the beautiful hills, or threaded the peaceful valleys, of Judea to the city guarded by the everlasting mountains, and adorned with the wondrous palace of the King of kings, would kindle into fervour ; loudly would he lift up his voice with harp and cymbal, and the sound of cornets, as his nation's anthem rose to heaven. Yet he might do this—many a Hebrew did this—without believing what prophets taught, without confessing his sins to God, without seeking forgiveness and imploring grace ; without hearty purposes of spiritual amendment, and, therefore, without returning home a wiser, a better, a happier man. It is remarkable that the joyful celebrations of that peculiar people, though appointed by God himself, are sometimes

spoken of by inspired ministers of religion in a strain which has led some modern speculators to conclude, rashly and groundlessly enough, that such observances were not, indeed, required at their hands. What the prophets condemn, however, is not the observances themselves, but the absence from the hearts of the people of the humility, the penitence, the practical faith, the moral obedience, of which such observances were designed to be the expression. There was nothing *religious* in being a Hebrew, in being circumcised, in approaching the temple, in remembering with joy the wonderful events of their history, in being proud of their fathers, and proud of their country; and, therefore, if they did not humble themselves before God, and cease to do evil, and learn to do well, all their services, and all their feelings, of whatever kind, with which they rendered them, went for nothing in religion.

The enthusiasm of the professed Christian may be aroused by sympathy, by imagination, or by art: eloquence may inspire it; music may inspire it; impressive forms may inspire it; but this enthusiasm is not religion, however it may be mistaken for it, or in whatever degree it may be found in association with that which is religion. Yet so it is, that all this is liked, cherished, delighted in, by those on whose mind religion sheds no light, in whose conscience religion sways no authority, whose temper and whose conduct are not better than they would be if no religion had ever been revealed. Why should this play of sen-

timent be better liked than the performance of duty? Why should the moving of the feelings be preferred to the doing of what is right? Why should indulgence take the place of obedience? Surely there is something wrong—essentially wrong—in the spiritual condition in which such perversion is so common. And it *is* common. This it is which presents itself to us as human nature dealing with religion, mocking God, and deceiving its own self.

5. *Man chooses the* HUMAN IN RELIGION RATHER THAN THE DIVINE. There must be the human in religion, for it is man's conduct towards God to which we give that name. But the conduct of man towards God requires that his religion should have a supreme regard to God as its motive, a humble reliance on Divine guidance for its methods, a grateful and earnest desire to please God, and to honour Him above all creatures, as its end and aim. If a man is moved to what he calls religion merely by a regard for himself, or for any created being; if he follows only the suggestions of his own mind, or of any other created mind; if he assumes authority in his own person, or submits to the authority of any other person or persons, to prescribe the terms or the modes of his religious service; if his aim is no higher than to gratify himself, or to please his fellow-man; it is a perilous confounding of things essentially different to call *this* religion. It begins and ends with man. It has nothing to do with God. It

is of the earth—earthly. It is human, altogether human; and is in no respect, in no degree, divine. Yet what better, what higher, what other religion than this, has man ever chosen, before that work of God within him which Christianity teaches among its elemental truths, and on which our attention is to be fixed, throughout the present inquiry?

We shall henceforth proceed on the assumption that we have here given a true report of *man's* spiritual condition. That this is substantially the account which is given in the Scriptures will be readily granted; that it accords with the testimony of conscience, and that it is borne out by what is known of man's history, will scarcely be denied. The unbribed confessions of it might be extracted from the monuments of all nations, in every age. The vouchers for its truth are in every land, in every house, in every heart. Sad indeed it is, and mournful, to behold such a nature in such a state. With the darkest sorrow do we look on the desolation, and sigh over a ruin such as this. Far from us be the withering disdain with which the philosopher or the misanthropist looks down on human nature; the sagacity with which the practised worldling tears the veil from such hearts as he has had to cope with; or the self-complacency with which the mere theologian rejoices in making good his arguments by texts and instances. Our own waywardness and folly are to be confessed to Him who knows us altogether, with a broken heart and a contrite spirit; no true

penitent would wish to obtrude them on the view of any fellow-mortal. And surely it is with a kind of sympathetic contrition, with humiliation and grief, that we see the sinfulness to which our own hearts bear witness betrayed by our brethren, by all our brethren, as well as by ourselves! The very sinfulness of man is a proof of the grandeur and perfection of that moral constitution, of the sublimity and loveliness of that spiritual nature, which sin has disturbed, injured, and degraded.

Yet while we grieve for man, we are not to forget our loyalty to God. All sin is against Him. We cannot think of the dishonour done to Him by sin without resentment, without that *sorrow which has reference to God*.^{*} We are not upbraiding man for the sake of vindicating a religious creed. Our creed respecting man is man's own creed. We learn it in the world. We feel it with bitter anguish to be true. We study it that our minds may be justly affected by it. We urge the study on others that they, too, may be justly affected by it. We press it the more, because we look on man neither with apathy nor with despondency, but with the anxiety of mingled hope and fear. We know that for this evil, all this evil, there is a remedy, one remedy, and only one—the remedy which is revealed in the Gospel. We have fears irrepressible, and beyond all utterance, for those who slight the evil, and refuse the remedy. For

* Κατὰ θεὸν λύπη, 2 Cor. vii. 10.

those who feel how deeply they have fallen, from what a height, and how inexcusably, the hope is strong within us that, turning away from such as would "slightly heal their hurt," they will repair to the wise and good Physician, who probes the wound that he may apply the "saving health," which is the only balm for the pierced and outraged nature of "the spirit of man which is within him."

Thirdly:—WHAT ARE THE WANTS OF THE HUMAN SPIRIT? In other words, WHAT OUGHT MAN TO BE WHICH HE IS NOT, IN ORDER TO HIS RESTORATION TO GOD?

Let our attention for the present be confined to such an answer to this question as we may draw from our own consciousness, and by fair and legitimate reasonings from this consciousness. We are satisfied, on grounds which have been stated, that our spiritual constitution is adapted to the perception of the true, to the doing of the right, to the enjoyment of the good; while our consciousness assures us that, in point of fact, the false is chosen instead of the true, the wrong instead of the right, the evil instead of the good. We need be at no loss, then, to understand that, whatever may be the cause of this wrong choice, that cause must be removed, and an opposite cause or *principle* must be brought into action. Now, we can conceive of the cause of this wrong choice in no other way than,—either as an unavoidable weakness in the moral perceptions of the human spirit; an irre-

sistible motive from without; or an inward and spontaneous predisposition, which, when unfettered and unchecked, issues in a wrong choice. Let each of these views be examined separately.

1. We can conceive of the human spirit being so feeble in its perceptions, so erroneous in its judgments, so inadequate in its ability to reason soundly on its own actions, that it cannot avoid choosing to act in that way which we condemn as wrong. But are we to conceive of so imperfect and controlled a being as accountable, or as capable of being accountable, for its actions? If language expresses thought, one would suppose that it is simply not congruous with the idea of such a being, and with the idea of accountableness, to think of such a being as accountable. The very notion of accountableness *involves* that of capacity of discrimination, which, however, by the very terms, is denied to the kind of being we have described. The one affirmation that man is such a being—man in general, or any particular man—and the other affirmation that man is accountable—man in general, or the particular man in question—are two affirmations that cannot stand together. They are contradictory, and mutually destructive. If the first be true, the second must be false; if the second be admitted, the first must be abandoned. The present question relates to the first of these affirmations. *Is it true that man has not the capacity of knowing what he ought to be, and what he ought to do?* We have appealed already to the

human consciousness. We appeal to it again. We may ask each person—do you not know what you ought to be, and what you ought to do? We appeal to the language of men, to their expectations from each other, and to their judgments of each other. We appeal to the style and tone in which men are addressed, and in which they are described, in the book of God. It is acknowledged that there are great varieties in the degrees of human intelligence as bearing on moral actions. But in each degree the range of obligation is limited by the intelligence; and it is *within* the range of that intelligence and obligation that we place every man's capacity of knowing what is right. We may be reminded that men are often untaught, or, what is worse, taught wrongly; and that, therefore, their habits of thought respecting their own actions are not such as to bring their intelligence into free and healthy play. Yet this implies that they *have* the intelligence, the ability to know what is right, that ability which is supposed to be damaged by causes beyond themselves—a supposition which we shall consider presently. Confining our view, just now, to what man is in himself, that is, in possession and in the free use of all his natural powers, we see no reason for laying the blame of his wrong choice—the matter immediately before us—on the imperfection of his capacity for knowing how he ought to choose. And, as for the means of knowledge, there is the dictate of his moral nature; there is the law of social life; there is the tradition of successive

ages ; there is the written law of God. To suppose a being who has no knowledge of moral distinctions, no conscience, no perception of religious obligation, no sense of responsibility, is to suppose a case in which moral choice is not possible ; but such is *not* the case with which we are now dealing ; we are seeking to account for a fact, for the acknowledged fact, of a wrong choice being made instead of a right choice. Even though it were admitted that some isolated cases, or whole groups of cases, might be accounted for by the limitation of natural faculties, we could leave these out of our present estimate ; but then what are we to make of the cases, known to be innumerable, in which the wrong choice is made, with the most explicit knowledge that it is wrong ; made against the dictates of the clearest reason ; against the remonstrances of conscience ; made by persons practised in moral distinctions, and even by experienced expounders of the law ? In each instance of this description we must seek for some other cause for the wrong choice than inability to discern the right.

2. We can suppose the human spirit to be overborne by an irresistible motive from without. Let it be said that our judgments of every kind, and our moral judgments in particular, are swayed by the judgments of our teachers, or our associates ; and that the contagion of example may be too strong and too active, too near and too constantly present, to be resisted ; that the object of men's

desires may be presented to the senses or the imagination with a force which bears down all the authority of reason and conscience; that habits insensibly, because slowly, formed, may acquire the entire mastery of the spiritual nature; and that any of these singly, still more all of them in combination, may suffice to account for a wrong choice being made. We are free to concede that in such circumstances there would be *no free choice at all*, and, consequently, no wrong choice. But let it be considered, at the same time, that no teaching can annihilate the power of conscience, any more than it can annihilate the senses, the memory, or the judgment; that example has no force when opposed to the dictates of the conscience; that men have a power to oppose, to neglect, and, by intelligent and moral reflection, to neutralise the sensitive and imaginative allurements; and that all the moral habits which men form result from a series of voluntary actions, in *every one* of which a distinct and separate choice is made. Besides this, the cases are infinitely numerous in which the wrong choice is made, when the force of example, whatever that may be, is on the side of right; when the outward motives are few, and would be feeble to a mind otherwise disposed; and when there is either no previous habit in relation to the particular action, or a habit leading in the contrary direction. From all this it follows, that the *case supposed* is not the ordinary state in which a wrong choice is made, and therefore cannot exhibit the ordinary cause

of a wrong choice; and, moreover, it follows that, where the case supposed does arise, it is not one in which the wrong choice, for which we are seeking the cause, has been made.

3. We can conceive of an inward and spontaneous predisposition which, unfettered and unchecked, issues in a wrong choice. We may attempt to analyse this predisposition; but the finest analysis results in the ultimate fact of a man's consciousness that he has an inclination, a liking, a spirit which is his own, which he cherishes, which he seeks to gratify, and which is the reason why *he* takes that view of external objects, or of his own act in relation to such objects, which becomes the motive for his choice. To deny that there is such an ultimate fact as this, is to deny that of which our consciousness makes us sure; and to overlook this fact is to substitute for the actual free choice of the human spirit a *merely metaphysical abstraction*, which has no relation to human nature, as human nature is. It is on this actuality of man's spiritual nature, and on this alone, that we can found the notions of personal responsibility, of moral obligation, and of religious duty; so that, besides the indestructible evidence of consciousness, as to the fact itself, we have the additional evidence afforded by the sense of responsibility, of moral obligation, and of religious duty, that we are right in affirming that the cause, the sole cause, in every instance, of a wrong choice, in a moral action, is—a *man's own spirit*. Our way to the simple truth,

therefore, lies plain before us. That which man ought to be, but is not, is this—inwardly and spontaneously propense to the right, the morally good, the truly religious, in harmony with the nature and with the will of God. The opposite propension must be removed; and this right principle must come into action, or he still remains an alien from God, and—being such—in-capable of pleasing God, and unfit to enjoy His presence. Man needs much instruction for his mental development, careful training, infinite corrections in his actual views of things to be done; but all this falls short of being “renewed in the spirit of his mind.” He needs, undoubtedly he needs, some ground of acceptance with God which is not in himself; and, according to the Gospel, that ground is laid by the grace of God in the propitiation of Jesus Christ, which is revealed to him that, by believing, he may be saved; but it is not in *the spirit* of man to believe in this propitiation, so as to accept the free gift of Divine love, until he becomes one of the sons of God, who are “born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.”

Fourthly :—We are thus prepared for receiving with intelligence and with meekness THE LESSONS WHICH GOD HIMSELF HAS GIVEN US, AS TO THE WAY IN WHICH THIS, THE GREATEST WANT OF MAN, IS TO BE SUPPLIED.

We are now no longer to appeal to the consciousness of man. He has unveiled his nature to our

spiritual sight. He has told us that his acts are not according to that nature. We see that he must be changed, or he must be hopelessly unhappy through the entire duration of his being.—We discover nothing in man to effect his own change. His disposition being what it is, and has always been, we must conceive of it remaining as it is, unless it be changed from without.—We are not conscious of any power in us to change the disposition of our brother man. To his understanding we may exhibit truth; to his conscience we may address appeals; and in both we may succeed, and often do succeed: we secure his assent to truth; we lodge conviction in his soul; but nothing that we present to him becomes an *actual motive*, however clearly its truth may be perceived, however seriously its reason and right and authority may be responded to, until his spirit is changed; and this we cannot touch; it is the secret domain, the inaccessible spring, the pith and centre of his being—the *spirit* of the man, his individuality,—his very self.

What man does not, will not do, has not done for himself, and what one man has not the power to do for another, must either remain undone, or God must do it. Whether God *can* do it or not, may be either a very simple, or a most complicated question. Take it in its simplicity, and it admits of only one reply: “*with God all things are possible.*” Take the question as it really stands, that is, as it is complicated with other questions, and you find

yourself surrounded with some of the stoutest difficulties that have ever tested the thinking powers of man; for you have to draw the line between the psychical and the moral, between the voluntary and the not voluntary, between the human and the Divine, in spiritual agency; you are to show what we are to conceive of God as doing without deviating from that in his nature which is the foundation of all moral government; you are to exhibit the discordance, or the harmony, which there may be, between the passive and the active, in a being who is the subject of a moral government; you are to sound the depths of man; and you are to feel how unfathomable are the depths of God. Should there be any person to whom these questions are new, or by whom they have not been pondered, with the calm, earnest, and prolonged attention which they require and deserve, he may hastily decide them one way or other, according to his modes of thinking; or, overlooking them, he may take *that which is not evidence as a reason for believing*; or, presuming that his mode of interpreting Scripture is entitled to the authority which belongs only to an inspired teacher, he may fearlessly, and without hesitation, affirm that it is, or it is not, congruous with man's nature, and with God's nature, that God should do this work.

Whatever conclusion men are led to adopt, there are some limits within which that conclusion must be found, or it cannot be true.

I. Any work which we ascribe to God in chang-

ing the spirit of man must be conceived of as *doing no violence to the conscious freedom and activity of man's nature*. The end to be secured by the change which we perceive to be necessary, is—the doing by man of what is right. The right thing to be done is to be—the man's own act. It cannot be his own act, if it is not that which he chooses to do; he cannot be said to do it of his own choice, if it is done *in* him and *upon* him by another. We know that there is an infinite difference between an instrument, unconscious, passive, or even unwilling, and a free agent. We can conceive of man being the instrument of any purpose of God; but in so far as he is such an instrument we cannot conceive of him as an agent; he is not in that respect an agent; to think of him as such is a confusion of thought; to speak of him as such is a misuse of language. The thing required, in the case now before us, however, is not instrumentality, it is agency. Any work which God is supposed to do in man, must be supposed as done in perfect harmony with that constitution—the whole of that constitution—which he has made to be essential to man. Whether we conceive of the act of God as miraculous, in the received sense of miracles, or as the natural and ordinary mode of Divine action on disordered spiritual natures, we cannot rationally conceive of it as rendering the subsequent acts of man less free, less *his own chosen acts*, than those acts which he performed before the change took place. We are not now raising

any question of the abstract possibility of the act of God being different from that which the present argument contemplates; nor of the desirableness of his doing that, whatever it may be, without which there is no hope for man; nor of the wisdom, or the righteousness, or the goodness of God, in so interfering as to accomplish the designs of his love to man: without, at present, affirming or denying anything relating to these points, we are concerned to make it clear that—the case being what it is—it is not in our power to conceive of God substituting a good for an evil principle of action in the human spirit, otherwise than in perfect conformity with what our consciousness reveals to us as essential to the very nature of voluntary—that is, free activity in man. If no constraint is put on the constitution of human nature, if the idea of Divine power doing that which man is required himself to do, is to be rejected, there remain, so far as we can see, only two things which we can conceive of being done; either the work is one purely of moral suasion, of considerations addressed *to the mind*, as reasons and objective motives, such as are addressed to all men in the ordinary course of Divine government; or the work is altogether of a different nature, not indeed opposed to moral suasion, not accomplishing its end independently of it, yet so acting on *that* in man which we have called his disposition, that freely, of his own choice, he yields to the suasion, and acts according to the will of God. If we have stated the case aright,

the cause of the wrong choice *is that* which makes all objective motives weak or powerful according as they are agreeable or disagreeable to *it*; but Divine moral suasion goes no further than offering considerations which are wise and good and right; so that, in fact, it appeals to one who does not *like* the thing which is right; and it is because the case is thus, and not otherwise, that we are driven to the conclusion that “the spirit of man” must be changed, or his free actions towards God will not be what truth and justice demand, what the nature of man and the will of God require that they should be. Now it is the failure of moral suasion to induce man to do what he is free to do or not to do, according to his choice, that *constitutes the exigency*; therefore the exigency cannot be relieved, the difficulty is not solved, the change contemplated will not be effected, by the most perfect moral suasion of which it is possible to conceive. Moral suasion has its functions, its limits; else how come we to distinguish it from force? But if, all the functions of moral suasion being exhausted, and its limits touched, man still sins against God—and this, remember, *is* our case—something else, if anything else there be, must be relied on for doing that which moral suasion has not done, and, as it would seem, cannot do.

Can we, then, conceive of a work of God in relation to the “spirit of a man” which, without being incompatible with moral suasion, or independent of it in bringing out its human results,

is yet different from it, so different from it as to go deeper into man's nature, and to secure to moral suasion those moral consequences which, without such a work of God, it fails to produce? If we feel sure that there could be no such work without a Divine force overpowering the human freedom, thus making the consequent actions Divine actions, and not human, then it is not on such a work that we could rely for securing what we seek — *the free and healthy action of man's own nature in his relation to God*. But, if we do not feel sure of this, if we can conceive of the possibility of such a work not overpowering the human freedom—if the Scriptures teach us that such a work is done, and at the same time that man's freedom is unimpaired, then that is the work on which we are to rely for the beginning of man's spiritual recovery and salvation.

II. Any work which we ascribe to God in changing the spirit of man must be conceived of *as doing no violence to the principle of Divine government*. By the principle of the Divine government, it is presumed, you understand that of attributing to man his own proper acts, and dealing with him righteously according to those acts. That which God does is not done by man; that which man does is not done by God. The agencies are as really distinct as the personalities; not more, not less, but equally distinct. Since man is not God, but God's creature, so man's acts are not the Creator's acts, but the creature's acts; and it is

because those acts are freely and properly, in the fullest sense in which such words can apply to a creature, his own, entirely his own, exclusively his own, that man is held responsible, is praised or blamed, fares well or ill, according to his doings. The principle of Divine government is, in truth, the Divine nature, in its moral relation to such a creature as man: that nature cannot be any other than it is; and, therefore, we may not attribute to God any work which is not consistent with it. We cannot justly conceive of God but as doing that which is not only far from being wrong, but as doing that which is right, so far as the qualities of right and wrong may be qualities of which the supposed act is susceptible.

It does not seem to us to be consistent with right government, *as such*, to do anything for a subject of that government which will exempt him from the natural and moral consequences of his own acts; and we cannot see how it is possible, on the principle of moral government *solely*, for a sinner against God to receive pardon of a past transgression, whatever change might appear in his subsequent life: the transgression is not expiated by the performance of subsequent duty: so that unless there be some real and adequate expiation for the former transgression, such an expiation as offers a *just reason* for pardon, we see no way in which it can be right for the Just One to pardon a sinner. If there be such an expiation as shall make it right to pardon the sinner, then, on the ground

of the same expiation, it is right to bestow on him any kind of benefit, and any degree of happiness, which may be included in the designs of infinite intelligence and goodness.

III. Any work which we may ascribe to God in changing the spirit of man must be conceived of as *not necessarily arising out of the relations which His moral government of man has established*. By a work necessarily arising out of such relations is meant a work without which man could not be righteously held to be responsible, and dealt with in a way of moral government. If it were supposed that man is not responsible to God *until* he becomes the subject of such a change as we are now contemplating, it would follow, inevitably, that man, as he is—the unrenewed man—is not a sinner, a sinner in that sense, and to that extent, which requires that he shall be changed in order to his becoming right and happy.

In the case supposed, a spiritual change in a sinner is not the matter that we should be discussing; it would then be the endowment of a sinless creature, hitherto incapable of moral government and responsibility, and of right or wrong in his actions, with a new faculty—capacitating him to be what he has not been. This is not the thing with which we have now to do. We have to do with a sinner against God, with the change of his spirit from evil to good, so that his free action towards God shall henceforward be right and not wrong. We have to do with one who is *naturally*

possessed of a moral constitution, intelligence, conscience, the power of self-government, and the sense of responsibility; and who, possessing all these advantages, has freely acted towards God as he knows he ought not to have acted. It is not essential to our conception of the right government of God that He should, as the Head of that government, as the Judge of man's secret thoughts, as the Awarder of man's eternal deserts, afford him more than the capacity, the opportunity, and the rational motives for knowing and doing what is right. If man sins against God, in violation of his own conviction, in opposition to the motives by which he ought to have been led (and, had he not chosen otherwise, *would* have been led) to obedience, what can we conceive of as fairly arising out of his moral relation to God, but that he shall be condemned? We acknowledge that it is right that the man who sins should be condemned: his own heart acknowledges that it is right. It ought, therefore, to be clearly apprehended by us, and as constantly remembered, that a change in a sinner's spirit towards God *is not necessary as an element of responsibility, or as a ground of moral government*: for, on the contrary, his sin as one who is responsible and who, being responsible and offending, is condemned by God's moral government, constitutes the ground of our certainty that he needs a change, and of our inquiry, whether he *can* be changed. Unless there be *that* in the Supreme Being which is not his Moral Authority, and by virtue of which we can

conceive of His doing a work which we cannot conceive of His doing as the Supreme Governor, we see no ground for hoping that man—the sinner—can be changed into man—the sinless. There may be—indeed, it is probable on various grounds that there is—a mode of viewing God which, without being inconsistent with the principle of His government, lays hold of another principle, co-essential and co-eternal with it; though in the order of development it may be either antecedent to it, or contingent on it; and if we can convert that probability into a certainty, if we can be *sure* that it *is so*, then, but not till then, do we see intelligible and safe reasons for attributing to God that spiritual change without which, though the man may be governed, the sinner cannot be blessed.

IV. Any work which we ascribe to God in changing the spirit of a sinner, must be conceived of as *being mysterious, but not more mysterious, nor otherwise mysterious, than some other works which we ascribe to God.*

Mystery is relative to our present state of knowledge, to our means of knowing, or our capacity of knowing. We know that God *is*, while a thousand questions arise respecting *how* He is, what is the mode of His being, which we cannot solve, because they relate to a subject which bears no analogy to our consciousness. In like manner, we may know that God *acts*; and for the same simple reason we do not know *how* he acts. Whatever work, therefore, we ascribe to Him, is a work which is mys-

terious to us, beyond the analogy of our consciousness, above the range of our experience. But, as there is an acknowledged class of Divine works which we call natural, ordinary, harmonious, on which we build the doctrines of natural philosophy, and of natural theology, so there is a class of Divine works not included in this series, such as Creation, Inspiration, and the entire course of miracles, on which we build our belief of a Divine revelation, and which, though not more mysterious in themselves, (for, indeed, nothing is in itself mysterious,) are felt to be more remote from our apprehension. We know, from evidence, that such works have been; we also know that, in some respects, they differ from the Divine works with which we are familiar; but we do not know *how* these things have been done. Now the work which we ascribe to God in changing "the spirit of a man" is not like any other work which we are conscious of doing ourselves; it is, therefore, more mysterious to us than our own conscious acts can be. And the work which we thus ascribe to God may, or may not, belong to those Divine operations which we speak of as ordinary and natural. If it is regarded as belonging to them, then it cannot be more mysterious than any other Divine work of the same class. The renewing of a sinner, thus viewed, cannot be more mysterious than the moral government of responsible agents, or the psychical government of intellectual beings, or the physical administration of material forces. But if the work of God

in "the spirit of a man" presents aspects which men do not perceive to be analogous to any department of His government, we are not helped in our contemplation of such aspects of this work by what we find elsewhere. As the laws of cohesion, of attraction and repulsion, of antagonist forces, and of chemical changes, are not resolved into the law of gravitation, so the laws of vegetable and of animal life are not resolved into any of the foregoing laws. In like manner, the laws of Thought are not mere modifications of physiological laws; neither are the laws of moral agency the same as the laws of intellectual apprehension. It may be that what is done in renewing the human spirit differs in some respects from that which is done according to the laws of moral agency: if so, the laws of moral agency *alone* cannot explain it; and no appeal to those laws will lie against any explanation of it which is drawn from other sources: this particular work of God, so regarded, belongs to another department more remote from ordinary experience, and, in that sense, more mysterious. Even if a man were to regard it as belonging to the department to which Creation, Inspiration, and Miracle belong, it cannot be more mysterious than any other work belonging to the same department. Whether the Divine work now in question does belong to that department or not, it is not our present business to determine. It is not easy, we do not say it is impossible, to fix the limits of that department: it requires more knowledge, more

comprehensiveness of intellectual grasp, more patient and varied examination of deep analogies, than fall to the lot of most men. For anything that we know to have been proved to the contrary, this whole department of the Divine working may be to Him, and indeed may be to some of His creatures, nay, to ourselves hereafter, as natural, as ordinary, as harmonious, as the more familiar courses of events which such language is used to describe; and miracle, as well as mystery, may be nothing else than a sign of our present limited experience, and imperfect apprehension.

But supposing that there are reasons for not placing the work of God in renewing the human spirit in the same category with the miraculous, there is nothing absurd in believing that, without being properly miraculous, this work of God performed in given conditions, and according to a settled and understood method, may occupy a department in the manifold workings of omnipotence, to which science knows no parallel, and for which language has no name. What we know of this particular work may be all we know of such Divine operations, without its being all that is *knowable*; we may be but on the verge of a firmament—a vast expanse of systems in which, as in other firmaments, the more we know, the more we perceive to lie beyond us; and where the light that dazzles us at first may lead us afterwards to scenes of more majestic order than our heart could have conceived. The spiritual world is infinitely grander.

than the material. Shall we marvel if its laws are more diversified? Nature is a large word, standing for a large reality, and among her many laws, the many ordinary procedures by which The Lord of Nature's Thought comes forth in action, who shall say there is not one peculiar law of nature, by which He brings wandering spirits to Himself?

V. Any work which we ascribe to God in changing the spirit of a sinner must be *clearly taught in the inspired Scriptures*, and gathered, like other scriptural doctrines, from a full consideration and fair comparison of all the facts, statements, prayers, reasonings, and exhortations bearing on this subject, which they contain. The revelation of God is given to make us "wise unto salvation." As each successive portion of revelation implies the truth, and supposes the knowledge, of the portions previously revealed, so the revelation *as a whole* implies the truth, and supposes the knowledge, of all that may be known of man, and of God, without the revelation. For this reason we have hitherto confined ourselves to such appeals, and such reasonings, as are within our natural competency, not enforcing them by the authority of holy Scripture. But when we come to say that God *does* anything to change the spiritual condition of man, and to affirm *what* He does, we enter upon new and holy ground. We must consult the oracle. We understand the questions; we must receive the answers to them from God himself. Our only reason for making any affirmation must be—"thus it is written;" our

only ground of certainty—"all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."*

Then to the Scriptures we will go. Let us go to them with the consciousness, with the principles, with the knowledge of man, and the knowledge of God, on which the Scriptures ground their appeals to us.—Let us go to them with a clear mind; clear from prejudice, from doubt, from one-sidedness, from love of human system, from the slavery of human tradition on the one hand, and from the extravagance of intellectual license on the other.—Let us go to them for that which is true, not for the confirmation of what we wish to appear true.—Let us go to them with a humble heart; with calmness; with confidence in our infallible Teacher; with meek docility.—Let us go to them in love:—the temple of inspiration is profaned, its sanctity is defiled, by the grossness of human passion; its tranquillity is disturbed by the clamour of dispute and strife; the heart that loves not, brings back no response, but a terrible rebuke.—Let us go to them with prayer. Prayer becomes us, for we are weak. Prayer becomes us, for we know nothing of God, but as we are taught. Prayer becomes us, for we have sinned; and we can be neither good nor happy unless God have mercy on us.—Let

* 1 Tim. iii. 16, 17.

us go to them with the purpose of following their guidance. Whatever opinion they tell us to resign, let it be resigned. Whatever sacrifice they bid us lay upon the altar, let it be cheerfully and reverently offered as the first cluster of the vintage, or the first sheaf of harvest. Whatever they require that we should do, let us do it at once, and always. Whatever hope they kindle, let us feed the fire, and fan the flame, till the things we hope for are among the things within us, which our own spirit knows, and with which "a stranger doth not intermeddle."

LECTURE II.

THE GENERAL DOCTRINE OF SCRIPTURE RELATING TO THE SPIRIT OF GOD.

“THE THINGS OF GOD KNOWETH NO MAN, BUT THE SPIRIT OF GOD.”

1 Cor. ii. 11.

OUR consciousness enables us to comprehend what is meant by a spirit. The earliest and simplest of analogies assures us, that outward acts resembling our own are the manifestations of a spirit resembling our own. This same consciousness prepares us to understand what is meant when we are told that “God is a Spirit.” Such a description of God appeals to our knowledge of ourselves, and of our own attributes. We conceive of him as *That* of which each of our own spirits is at once the production and the likeness. Omitting from our conception of Him all that is limited in our own consciousness, we conceive of Him as being, as knowing, and as doing ; as being, without the conditions of finite time, and of finite space ; as knowing, without inquiry, or reasoning ; as doing, what He pleases, when he pleases, and as He pleases. We conceive of Him as worthy of all admiration, confidence, and love ; as good, and

therefore right ; as right, and therefore just ; as perfect, and therefore incapable of change. By the consciousness of our own spiritual power, we understand what is meant by “the power of God ;” and by the effects which our own power produces, we understand what is said of the effects produced by His power. Indeed, our very imperfection suggests, by contrast, an intelligent apprehension of an agency which cannot be imperfect.

So that we are not using words without meaning when we speak of that which God may be conceived to do in restoring the depraved spirit of man to the condition which develops the healthy working of his original nature. We can distinctly understand the thing to be done—the result to be secured. Whether we can understand the Divine act itself, is another matter. So far as it is analogous to acts of our own, or acts which we can rationally conceive of ourselves as doing, we do understand it ; so far as it is not analogous to acts of our own, or to acts which we can conceive of ourselves as doing, we do not understand it : it is, then, beyond our range ; it differs from our agency in kind, not merely in degree ; and, consequently, it transcends our comprehension. Whatever God is supposed to do through any medium, as by instruction, suasion, sympathy, or example, we clearly understand ; for this is the kind of work which each of us is doing to others, or having done to him by others, every day. But if God is supposed to do anything for the renova-

tion of a depraved human spirit *without* any medium — which is neither instruction, nor moral suasion,—that which He is thus supposed to do, we understand not : it is above our comprehension, because it is not like anything within the range of our own conscious agency. It is sufficiently clear, however, that this incomprehensibleness of a supposed act of God, is neither a reason for, nor a reason against, believing that such an act may be, or actually is, performed ; yet, in relation to a purpose which has not been accomplished by what we do understand, but is said or thought to be accomplished in a way which we do not understand, the proof of the thing being done would be a proof of a mode of spiritual agency in God which has no analogy with any mode of spiritual agency in man.

In such a case, the act ascribed to God would be intelligently ascribed to him, for the clearest and strongest of all reasons ; and at the same time the way in which He has done it would be among the mysteries of light which are too dazzling and too high for us to look upon.—The appeal to human consciousness assures us that a work which is not of man, but of God, is needed to renew us after the image of God. We have offered this as a fair conclusion from what every man knows of himself, and from what each man *may* know from observation, from testimony, and from just analogy, of all other men. Whether there is such a work of God, and if there is, what it is, we must gather,

not from man, but from God. With this conviction, and for this purpose, we now come reverently, devoutly, and calmly, to ask the great Spirit whom we worship, whether it be true or not that He works in a man, for his salvation ; and, if He does so work, how far it is a work which we can understand, in order that we may set about understanding it, and wait or act according to that understanding ; and how far it is a work which we can *not* understand, in order that, so regarding Him, we may bow down with awful adoration at His footstool.

This course of Lectures ought not to have been undertaken by a man who had not arrived at definite results, at positive judgments. Our positive judgment — the definite result of our studies, is—*that there is a work of God in man which secures his salvation ;* that this work is spiritual ; that in accomplishing this spiritual work, there is nothing opposed to the moral nature of man, nothing incompatible with the principle of Divine government, nothing that is more mysterious than other works which we unhesitatingly ascribe to God ; that in securing the *moral results* of this work, the Divine agency is of a nature which we readily understand, because it is analogous to those works which are daily exemplified in human agency ; that in beginning, carrying on, and completing this Divine work, there is, also, a Divine agency of a spiritual nature which we do not understand, because it transcends all the analogies which are supplied by our own consciousness. The convic-

tions which we thus avow, result from a patient and, we trust, devout examination of what, we believe, God himself has taught us in His own word.

That teaching is our present theme.

First:—THE SCRIPTURES TEACH US THAT THERE IS A WORK OF GOD IN MAN, WHICH SECURES HIS SALVATION.

It will be conceded by most persons that such is the apparent meaning of all those passages of the New Testament which may be arranged under the following heads of classification.

I. Those passages which describe God as beginning and performing a work in those who are called “believers,” “holy persons,” “the saved.”*

II. Those passages in which certain persons are spoken of as begotten and born of God.†

III. Those passages in which salvation is ascribed to the “calling,” “power,” “grace,” or “gift of God.”‡

Secondly:—THE SCRIPTURES TEACH US THAT THERE IS A WORK OF THE SPIRIT OF GOD IN MAN, WHICH SECURES HIS SALVATION.

Before treating this department of inspired instruction on the subject now before us, we shall have to deal with some preliminary inquiries; and this will exhaust the remaining space devoted to the present Lecture.

I. WHAT ARE WE TO UNDERSTAND BY THE SPIRIT, THE HOLY GHOST, THE SPIRIT OF GOD?

* See Note D.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid.

By these phrases in the New Testament we are to understand either—a peculiar mode of describing God as acting; or the agency of a being who is created by God; or one who, though personally and officially distinct from the Father, *as* the Father; and from the Son, *as* Son; is yet, *with* the Father and the Son, one God.

(1.) That the general fact of Divine agency is expressed in a peculiar mode when the Spirit of God is spoken of, it is impossible to doubt. As the “spirit of man” means man in action, so by analogy, “the Spirit of God” is easily understood to mean *God* in action. Thus when we read in the Old Testament that “the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters;”* “by his Spirit he hath garnished the heavens;”† “thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created; and thou renewest the face of the earth;”‡ “the Spirit of God hath made me; and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life;”§ “but the Spirit of God came upon him;”|| “not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord;”¶ “whither shall I go from thy Spirit, whither shall I flee from thy presence?”**—we can have no doubt that the presence or agency here referred to is the presence or agency of God; and that it is expressed in a peculiar manner, for which it would not be difficult to assign apparently

* Gen. i. 3.

† Job xxvi. 13.

‡ Psal. civ. 30.

§ Job xxxiii. 4.

|| Judges iii. 10; vi. 34.

¶ Zech. iv. 6.

** Psal. cxxxix. 7.

sufficient reasons, grounded in the idioms of the Hebrew language. And even in the New Testament, there are numerous passages which obviously belong to the same class, and exhibit the same idiom. Thus when our Lord says, "If I cast out devils by the Spirit of God;"* and another evangelist represents him as saying, "If I with the finger of God cast out devils;"† we see that the phrases "*finger of God*," and "*Spirit of God*," are equivalent. In like manner, when it was said to the virgin spouse of Joseph, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee," the phrase "Holy Ghost" appears to mean the same mysterious agency as "the power of the Highest:" though we cannot fail to perceive that the "Holy Ghost," is a *peculiar mode* of expressing "the power of the Highest." In the same way, when the apostle says, "What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of a man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God," we can scarcely avoid understanding that, as "the spirit of man" means *man himself*, "the Spirit of God" means *God himself*. Guided by these simple and obvious passages of Scripture, we can detect no source of error in admitting, nay, in devoutly and earnestly maintaining, that "the Spirit of God," "the Spirit," "the Holy Ghost," are sacred expressions

* Matt. xii. 28.

† Luke xi. 20

which denote GOD *in action*. Whatever work, then, is ascribed by the inspired teachers to the Holy Ghost, is by them ascribed to God; because the acts so ascribed cannot be other than the acts of God; because the same acts are positively, and in the plainest words, ascribed to God; and because, as we have seen, “the Spirit,” “the Spirit of God,” “the Holy Spirit,” is GOD *Himself*.

(2.) This explanation, you at once perceive, does not apply to numerous passages of the Scriptures in which the agency of the Holy Spirit is recorded, or referred to, as that of a conscious, intelligent, and energetic agent, distinct in personality from “the Father,” and from “the Son,” and subordinate in His mission, and in His acts, to the Father, and to the Son. We cannot read the Scriptures with serious attention, and not be deeply impressed with the *marked peculiarity* of language with which the Spirit is represented, in prayers, in promises, in narratives, and in argumentative or hortatory appeals to men, and especially to holy men. “Take not thy Holy Spirit from me”* is a prayer which we should do well to compare with the acknowledgment, “Whither shall I go from thy Spirit?”† Examine such declarations as these in the Old Testament: “And now the Lord Jehovah and his Spirit hath sent me;”‡ “when the enemy shall come in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord

* Psa. li. 12.

† Psa. cxxxix. 7.

‡ Isa. xlviii. 16.

will lift up a standard against him ;”* “but they rebelled and vexed his Holy Spirit ;” “where is He that put His Holy Spirit within him ?”† “thou gavest them thy good Spirit to instruct them ;”‡ “thou testifiest against them, by thy Spirit, through thy prophets ;”§ “the words which Jehovah of hosts sent, by His Spirit, through the former prophets.”||

What can be meant by Jehovah taking His Holy Spirit from a man ; putting His Spirit in the midst of men ; *giving* His Spirit ; testifying by His Spirit ; sending words by His Spirit ? There is surely a distinction of *some kind*, between Him who takes, and Him who is taken away ; between Him who puts, and Him who is put ; between Him who gives, and Him who is given ; between Him who sends, and Him *by* whom He sends. Does God absolutely take away Himself ? give Himself ? send Himself ? Assuming, as we are warranted to assume, that “the Spirit of God” means GOD *in action*, we may ask, Is any candid reader of the Hebrew Scriptures satisfied with saying, that such passages are nothing more than peculiar modes of expressing the fact of Divine agency ? IS NOT THE AGENCY ITSELF PECULIAR ? Does not this peculiar agency suggest, nay, does it not require, the belief of a peculiarity in the nature of God, which *no mode of expression in human language can set forth* without involving an apparent contradiction ?¶

* Isa. lix. 19.

† Isa. lxiii. 10, 11.

‡ Nehem. ix. 20.

§ Nehem. ix. 30.

|| Zech. vii. 12.

¶ See Note E.

The same kind of distinction, we presume, was present to the mind of Jesus when he uttered those awful words: "I say unto you, that all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever shall speak against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come."* Sin is against a being—a person; blasphemy is against a person; God is the Being sinned against—blasphemed, in ordinary sin and blasphemy. "The Son of man" is a distinct person, the object of special speaking against. Is not the Holy Spirit, then, one person, who can be blasphemed, spoken against? And is not speaking against Him, blaspheming Him, as distinct from sin and blasphemy against God, as it is distinct from speaking against "the Son of man?" And what *can* this distinction be, on the admission, which cannot be avoided, that "the Holy Spirit" is God *himself*? Whatever this distinction is, we find it expressly affirmed in those remarkable and gracious assurances with which Jesus consoled the hearts of his sorrowing disciples in his discourse addressed to them before his death, where he promises to "pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth, whom the world

* Matt. xii. 31, 32.

cannot receive, because it seeth it not, neither knoweth it; but ye know it, for it abideth with you, and shall be in you.”* “The Comforter, the Holy Spirit, which the Father will send in my name—HE shall teach you all things, and shall bring to your remembrance all that I have said unto you.”† “When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, HE shall testify concerning me.”‡ “Except I depart, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I go away, I will send HIM unto you. And when HE is come, He will convict the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment.” “When *He*, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will guide you into all the truth, for He will not speak from *Himself*; but whatsoever things HE shall hear, He will speak; and He will declare to you things to come. HE will glorify me, for HE will receive of mine, and will declare it unto you.”§ In these passages Jesus speaks of the Spirit in the use of neuter pronouns, to agree with the neuter gender of the word Πνεῦμα, translated “spirit;” but when he speaks of the Spirit as *teaching, testifying, being sent by himself, convicting, guiding, speaking, declaring, glorifying* Jesus, he makes a distinct and express use of the masculine personal pronouns HE, HIM, HIMSELF. Is it possible to avoid the conclusion, that the Spirit is a conscious,

* John xiv. 16, 17.

† John xiv. 26.

‡ John xv. 26.

§ John xvi. 7, 8, 13, 14.

intelligent, energetic agent, who is not the Father, nor the Son? As Jesus himself had thus clearly expressed the distinct personal agency of the Divine Spirit, we are not surprised that the same Spirit should afterwards be spoken of as saying to Philip, "Go forwards and join that chariot;"* to Peter, "Arise, therefore, and get thee down, and go with them, nothing doubting, for I have sent them;"† to the prophets and teachers at Antioch, "Separate to ME Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them."‡ It is in perfect keeping with this actual distinctiveness of personal agency, that Barnabas and Saul are said to have been "sent forth by the Holy Ghost." Exactly on the same principle we read afterwards that when Paul and Silas had "gone throughout Phrygia and the region of Galatia, and were *forbidden* of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia, after they were come to Mysia, they assayed to go into Bithynia, but *the Spirit* suffered them not."§

(3.) Do we err in believing that He who thus directed the steps of evangelists, apostles, prophets, and teachers—the Holy Spirit—the Spirit of Jesus, is personally an agent, distinct from the Father, *as*

* Acts viii. 29.

† Acts x. 20.

‡ Acts xiii. 2. See Acts xv. 28; xxi. 11.

§ Acts xvi. 6, 7. After *πνεῦμα* many copies have *Ἰησοῦ*, the reading approved by Beza, Mill, Griesbach, Knapp, Vater, Scholtz, and followed by the Syriac, the Vulgate, and the Ethiopic versions. It is quoted by Cyril (Epist. ad Joan. Episcopum Antiochæ. Thesaur. c. 12. and by Jerome contra Pelag. l. 2, c. 6

the Father, and distinct from the Son, *as* the Son, and yet, *with* the Father and the Son one God? When, further, we read of the Spirit *making men bishops*; of signs and wonders being wrought by the power of the Holy Ghost; the Spirit giving men utterance; testifying to Paul that bonds and afflictions awaited him; witnessing; being given to them that obey God; being sent down from heaven; being lied unto; tempted; helping men's infirmities; renewing, sanctifying, leading, strengthening, and making intercession for them; sealing men; being grieved; searching; revealing; the Spirit which is from God; giving the word of wisdom, of knowledge, faith, gifts of healing, the working of miracles, prophecy, discerning of spirits, languages, and interpretations of languages; distributing to every one severally as He *willeth*; where are the forms of language that could more strongly mark the distinct attributes and energies of a personal agent? To these clear testimonies may be added those passages in the New Testament in which Christians are addressed as the temples of the Holy Ghost; in which it is prayed that the "communion of the Holy Ghost," with the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, may be with them; in which the name into which the nations are to be baptized is "*the name* of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" and in which both Jews and Gentiles are described as having access through Jesus Christ "by *one Spirit* unto the Father." We are in no

way concerned to deny that there is an apparent verbal contradiction in saying that the Spirit of God is God himself, and that the Spirit of God is not the Father, as He is not the Son ; for we do not know of any language in which the Holy Spirit can be spoken of which shall be entirely free from this apparent verbal contradiction. Still, whatever the apparent verbal contradiction may be, from what source soever it arises, on what principle soever it may be solved, or left alone as being incapable of being solved by any language received among men, here it is on the surface of the Scriptures ; and it presses on us with increasing force in proportion to the seriousness and diligence with which we study these Scriptures separately, and then compare them together.

(4.) It is said, indeed, that “the Spirit” is a term employed either to denote the sublime abstraction of Divine agency, or to describe the effects of that agency. We are not disposed to question either of these applications of the term. They are not less consistent with the acknowledgment, than they are with the denial, of a Divine personal agency, which is not the personal agency of the Father, nor the personal agency of the Son, but the personal agency of the Spirit. Suppose it could be admitted, for the sake of argument merely, that the Scriptures do present to our minds such a distinct personal agency of the Holy Spirit, it would be quite as natural to call that agency in the abstract, or the effects of that agency, the Spirit, as it con-

fessedly is, to represent by the same term any abstract conception, or any known effects, of the power of God. Whatever solution of apparent verbal contradiction would thus be furnished in the latter case, would serve as easily and as perfectly for the solution of apparent verbal contradiction in the former case. If “the Spirit” ever means Divine power generically apprehended, it *may* mean the power of the Spirit as a distinct agent generically apprehended. If “the Spirit” ever means the effects of Divine power, or agency, it *may* mean the effects of that power, or agency, which we ascribe to the Spirit as acting in distinction from the Father and from the Son, quite as exactly and as fully as it can mean the effects of the power, or agency, which we ascribe to the Father, as acting in distinction from the Son, and from the Spirit. The question with us is not whether the Spirit is a term *ever* applied, according to a well-known usage of language, to the abstract notion of Divine power, or to the effects of that power; but it is this—is the term *always* so applied? Would the explanation of *all* that is said in Scripture respecting the Holy Spirit be satisfactorily secured by this principle? We hope we are not less anxious, certainly we are not less bound, than other students of Scripture, to avoid grafting our own opinions on the language which we find in these holy writings. We profess to be as ready as others profess themselves to adopt only legitimate grammatical principles in interpreting

the language of the Scriptures. Now on what grammatical principles could we deny the personality of Him who is described as possessing knowledge, power, goodness, will, authority, a mission; who is spoken of in association with "the Father" and with "the Son," but who is not, and cannot be conceived of as being "the Father," or "the Son?" What is the use of language, with its divisions and its laws, if the express use of masculine pronouns, in grave didactic discourse, is not intended to represent the distinct personality of Him to whom they refer? Granting that it involves a contradiction *in words*, to speak of this distinct Divine person as one with "the Father" and with "the Son," at the same time that we speak of Him as personally distinct from "the Father" and from "the Son," it may be well to remember that these words are *words of Scripture*; that they are words selected by the Divine Teacher for the instruction of men in "the things of God," which "no man knoweth but the Spirit of God;" and that the contradiction which is to us apparent in the words, is not necessarily real in "the things" which it is not possible for any human language to express. We believe that there is one God, but in our conception of that God whom we believe to be one, neither is the Father God without the Son and the Spirit; nor is the Son God without the Father and the Spirit; nor is the Spirit God without the Father and the Son: the Father, the Son, the Holy Spirit, this is *the one God*.

(5.) The UNITY of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit is indeed a mystery—a fact clearly revealed, yet suggesting questions which no analogy of consciousness, no walk of human experience, enables us to solve. “Doth this offend” us? Shall we deny the fact? Shall we, in our pride of intellect, assume that the one God must be as one man—His unity shall be as one of our unities—that He cannot contain, in His own essential nature, the element of love, the object of love, and the manifestation of love; that the human definition of God must be the true definition; that if the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost be God, there must be three Gods, and not one, even though the Scriptures teach us that God, as revealed in the Scriptures—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—is “the only living and true God?” Rather let us acknowledge, for assuredly it well becomes us, that as “no man knoweth the things of a man but the spirit of man which is in him, even so *the things of God* knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.”

(6.) As the oneness of the Father, and the Son, and the Spirit, is a mystery, so likewise is the distinction between the Father, and the Son, and the Spirit. The Father is not the Son. The Spirit is neither the Father nor the Son. By too literal an application of words which, like all other words, are borrowed from the earthly and the human, not a few divines—especially such as used the wonderfully flexible language of the Greeks—sought to explain these distinctions; thus “the Generation”

of the Son by the Father, and the “Spiration,” “Procession,” or “Promanation” of the Spirit from the Father (or from the Father and the Son) are phrases occupying no mean place in the theology of the early ages. Now we humbly submit—whatever reverence may be due to holy synods, and to learned men—that such explanations are founded on an erroneous principle; for they are *analyses of human thoughts or words*, not developments of Divine realities. Neither, on the other hand, is anything gained by the apparent simplicity of regarding the distinctions actually set before us in Scripture between the Father, and the Son, and the Spirit, as merely variations of our way of thinking of the one God, resulting from his varied actions or offices, in effecting man’s salvation. The distinctions between the Father, and the Son, and the Spirit, are so plain, they are so manifestly personal, they so clearly involve *mutual* relations, and affections, that no modification of human thought can work them out from the conception of one being, such as each man is conscious that he is himself. When we are asked, then, whether we believe that there are, in the one God, three distinct Beings, minds, conscious agents, independent existences, we can only reply, that one part of the question relates to one class of beings, of which there are many, while the other relates to Him who is one. We do not read the New Testament as teaching that the Father is distinct from the Son and from the Spirit, *in the same way in which*

one man is distinct from another man: we do not perceive any analogy whatever between the creatures and the Creator, *in this respect*: and, therefore, we are in no wise perplexed by a question which assumes such analogy. The question may please some minds by its smartness; it may displease others by its flippancy; we waive it, simply, as irrelevant.

Leaving, then, all discussions which belong to the *metaphysic* rather than to the *theologic*, we find no difficulty in tracing the broad practical distinction between that which is done by the Father, and that which is done by the Son, and that which is done by the Spirit, in the salvation of men; and, however conscious we may be of our inability to determine matters lying far away from the present sphere of the human mind, we have no misgiving in our faith that it is God, and God alone, who saves us. We read that the Father sends, gives, pours out, the Spirit; and that the Son sends the Spirit; and that the Spirit "proceedeth from the Father;" but we do not read that the Father proceedeth from the Spirit, or that the Spirit gave his Son. We read that through the Son we have access by one Spirit unto the Father; but we do not read through the Spirit we have access by the Father to the Son; neither do we read that through the Father we have access by the Son to the Spirit. We read of being pardoned for the sake of Christ. We do not read of being pardoned for the sake of the Father, or for the sake of the Spirit. The same practical

distinction, it is well known, pervades the New Testament.

True it is, that God is spoken of in distinction from His Son, and in distinction from His Spirit; but when God is thus spoken of, it is sufficiently clear that the distinction, whatever it may be, is the same distinction which we find in other passages, between the Father and the Son, and between the Father and the Spirit. It is also true that, in numerous passages, God is spoken of absolutely, where no express reference is made to the Son or to the Spirit: our belief is, that as the titles, attributes, works, and honours, of God are rendered in Scripture to the Son, and to the Spirit, in the same terms in which they are rendered to the Father, we cannot exclude the Son or the Spirit from the full meaning of such passages. It is, furthermore, true that, of all those passages of the New Testament which we have adduced to prove that there is a work of God in man, there is not in one of them any express mention of the Spirit of God. But if the "Spirit of God" is *God Himself*, as the Scriptures teach us that He is, and if, besides this, the work which we have seen ascribed to God, is ascribed, as we shall hereafter show, to the Spirit of God, they not only harmonize with the passages where we ascribe the work to God, but at the same time explain them. As the distinction by virtue of which we cannot call the Spirit either the Father or the Son, is one which transcends our conception, though it is plainly stated to

be a fact, so the same actual distinction which prevents our ascribing to the Father, or to the Son, that which is done by the Spirit, warrants us to say, that this work of God is not the work of the Father—as the Father, nor the work of the Son—as the Son, because it is the work of the Spirit—as the Spirit.

A SECOND PRELIMINARY QUESTION RELATES to *those works of the Holy Spirit which do not renew, purify, and save a man.*

I. There are works ascribed to the Holy Spirit which have no direct bearing on the salvation of man, but of which it is desirable to take some notice here, if it were only to impress us more fully with the grandeur and majesty of that Spiritual Agency of which we shall have occasion to speak hereafter. We have quoted for another purpose the passages of the Old Testament in which the Spirit of God is spoken of as “moving on the face of the waters,” “garnishing the heavens,” “renewing the face of the earth,” “making a man,” and “giving him life.” We grant that these passages are capable of being explained without referring to that distinct personal agency which we find elsewhere ascribed to the Holy Spirit, as the Holy Spirit; but even then, it would appear to us to argue a superficial rather than a profound, reverential, or well-furnished mind, to make no account of the peculiar phraseology, which, though it might not *of itself* suggest the idea of a dis-

ting personal agency, yet harmonizes most remarkably with that idea when suggested by the language of subsequent revelations. No love of philosophical simplicity can excuse the neglect of inspired teaching. Truth is the only philosophy. At the basis of all theology we find such truths as these: the creation is the work of God; all the things that are, are what they naturally are, because He so willed it; they are preserved in being by Him; all their separate processes, and all their combined operations, are the filling up of plans formed by His wisdom, and are the results of His power. The manifestation of His infinite perfections to intelligent beings is *one* of the apparent designs which the enlightened observer can trace in all the works of God, and can trace the more exactly in proportion as he is endowed with a penetrating, capacious, disciplined, and devout habit of thinking on what he sees: the more we know of God, and the more religiously and practically we meditate on what we know of Him, the more desirous, and the better prepared, we are for knowing more. The Scriptures can scarcely be said to *reveal* these principles of natural theology. They rather build upon them. The fact that they do build upon them is one of the avowed reasons with the most thoughtful classes of men (nay, even with the least thoughtful classes of men, who think with any seriousness on subjects so deserving of all thought, it is a stronger reason than they perhaps would admit) why the Scriptures are

received as “given by inspiration of God.” He is heard speaking in His word, as we see Him moving in His works. Now since it is a fact that highly gifted men—Newton for example—have attained to more sublime conceptions than other men have reached, of the plan on which the material world is governed, shall we be surprised when inspired teachers tell us what, without them, we did not know, could not know, of the origin of these yet uncounted and unmeasured systems? Does it mortify an ingenuous mind to learn something respecting *the beginning of things*, which science has not demonstrated, which observation has not recorded, which analogy has not suggested, which even hypothesis, in the wildest and most vigorous flights of the human imagination, has not pictured? The letter of the Scriptures does contain revelations of this description. It not only tells us that the Spirit of God is actively and personally at work in perfecting the fair productions of Divine power: it also says of “the Word” who “was made flesh and dwelt among us,” that “all things were brought into being by Him, and without Him not one thing that has been brought into being, was brought into being;” that “in him was life; and the life was the light of men;”* “by whom also He made the worlds;” “who is the Image of the Invisible God, the First-born of the whole creation, for by Him were all things, those in the

* John i. 3, 4.

heavens, and those in the earth, the visible and the invisible, whether thrones, or lordships, or governments, or powers; all things have been created through Him and for Him: and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist.”* According to our conceptions of the One God, and of the distinction between the Father and the Son and the Spirit, there is a majesty in these descriptions that corresponds at once with the ineffable glory of the Creator, and with the mysterious sublimity of that work in which the Maker of man has become his Saviour.

We put it calmly to every reader of the Scriptures, whether the attribution of creation to the Son of God, and to the Spirit, is not as literal, and as plainly expressed, as the attribution of creation to God. It is so written. Then, how are we to understand the writing? Shall we reject it, explain it away, hold just the same belief as we should hold if it were *not* so written? What is this else than refusing to be taught anything respecting creation beyond that which we know without a revelation? But if we are to learn nothing of God by revelation beyond what we already know without revelation, what was there to reveal, what need of revelation, of what use can revelation be? We judge that it is better to draw our theology from revelation than to pare down revelation to our preconceived theology. We humbly aver that this is a procedure more

* Col. i. 15—47.

becoming the true dignity of the human intellect, more really philosophical, as well as more reverential and more devout, than that of fixing the extent of the knowledge we have without the Bible, as the boundary of the knowledge which we are willing to receive from the Bible.—If this principle of following what we believe to be the teaching of God Himself in His own word be ridiculed as the worshipping of a Book, we are not careful to rebut such ridicule; only we might say to those who are disposed to play with these light but dangerous missiles, How can you escape the charge of worshipping the *works* of God? We hold the revelation contained in the Scriptures to be as really a work of God as the creation, or the government of the universe; and we understand that it is one of the purposes of revelation to teach us some truths concerning that creation, and that government, which men have never learned by pure deduction from abstract principles, or by naked inference from scientific judgments. And, if these truths respecting the elements and laws of nature are found to harmonize with those higher (and to us more practically momentous) truths, which relate to our spiritual well-being, and our eternal prospects, we are the more confirmed in the belief of all these truths: each of these classes of truths has its own value, rests on its own evidence; and the comparison of each separate class illustrates the meaning, and establishes the authority, of the other.

II. There was a work of the Holy Spirit wrought in “the only Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.” It is not possible to read the inimitable narratives of the life of Jesus in the New Testament, without pausing to consider some strong and peculiar expressions which occur in these sacred compositions. Were it not for that undue love of the visible, the material, the external, which we have seen to be one of the characteristics of man’s religion, one might wonder how so superficial and inadequate a reading of *such a life* could have occurred. Yet we cannot understand THE LIFE OF JESUS by reading it in this unreflecting manner. We must read all that is written there in the holy books of the Evangelists; and, as we read, we must think of what the words we read are intended to *suggest* to us in reading them. The connexion of one part of the life of Jesus with another part is so important, so necessary to the right understanding of minute particulars, as well as to the full comprehension of the whole, that we must be allowed earnestly to request you to read the Gospels for yourselves. Read them for the purpose of seeing in them all that there is in them respecting Jesus. Read them, in connexion with the prophecies, of which they show you the fulfilment. Read them, too, in the light which beams upon them from the history of the Acts; from the statements, the reasonings, the allusions, the appeals, the exhortations of the Epistles; and from

the glorious visions of the Apocalypse. Not to read them thus, is to read them out of place; it is to attempt to read them in the dark; it is to read them so as not to reach their meaning.

Let us now lay before you those passages in the life of Jesus which are most likely to have been overlooked, for the express purpose of showing how entirely that life became what it was through the power of the Spirit of God resting on the Son of man. Long ere His advent it had been foretold of Him, "There shall come forth a shoot out of the stem of Jesse, and a fruitful sprout shall grow out of his roots; the Spirit of Jehovah shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and discernment, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord, so that he shall be of quick perception in the fear of the Lord."* "The Spirit of the Lord Jehovah is upon me; for Jehovah hath anointed me to publish glad tidings to the afflicted; He hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and to those that are bound complete deliverance; to proclaim the acceptable year of Jehovah, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn; to make glad the mourners in Zion; to give them beauty instead of ashes, the oil of gladness instead of mourning, the garment of praise instead of a desponding spirit; and they shall be

* Isa. xi. 1—3.

called the trees of righteousness, the plantation of Jehovah, that He may be glorified.”* Before his birth the angel said to his mother, “The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Holy Ghost shall overshadow thee; therefore also that Holy Offspring which shall be born of thee shall be called *the Son of God*.”† When he had been baptized, “the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending in a bodily shape like a dove, and lighting upon him.” After his baptism, the same Spirit abiding in him, and he being full of the Holy Ghost, he was led up by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil.‡ After the temptation in the wilderness, Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee.§ In the synagogue of Nazareth, he read “the place where it is written, The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. And he closed the book, and he gave it again to the minister, and he sat down. And the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on him. And he *began* to say unto them, This day is the Scripture fulfilled in your ears. And all bare him witness,

* Isa. lxi. 1—3.

† Luke i. 35.

‡ Matt. iv. 1; Mark i. 12; Luke iv. 1.

§ Luke iv. 14.

and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth.”*

Of his *miracles* he himself said, “If I cast out demons by the *Spirit of God*, then the kingdom of God is come unto you.” Of his ministry it was said by John, “He whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God; for God giveth not the Spirit by measure *unto him*. The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand.” Of his *presentation of his sacrifice* it is said, “who through the Eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God.” Of his *resurrection* it is said, he “was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead,” and that he was “put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; by which also he had gone and preached unto the spirits which were in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah.” It is said to the Roman Christians, “If the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit which dwelleth in you.”† The apostle Paul likewise prays for the Ephesians, that “the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the *spirit* of

* Luke iv. 17, 22.

† Matt. xii. 28; Luke xi. 20; John iii. 34, 35; Heb. ix. 14; Rom. i. 4; 1 Peter iii. 18—20; Rom. viii. 11.

wisdom and revelation . . . according to the working of his mighty power which He wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead." It is part of the great "mystery of godliness," in which God was manifest in the flesh, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory," that he was "justified"—vindicated from the charge of blasphemy in claiming to be the Son of God—"through the Spirit." When the disciples received Peter and John from their examination by the council, they addressed God in their prayer, saying, "Of a truth against thy holy Son Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together:" and Peter explains this "*anointing*," when he says to Cornelius and his friends, "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with power, who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil: for God was with him." *

This history of Jesus of Nazareth, you observe, is more than a delineation of a perfect and beautiful inward human nature displaying itself in these outward actions. He was "holy" as well as "harmless and undefiled, separate from sinners." His conception was a holy mystery. His baptism was a spiritual anointing. His works, the manner of them, as well as the power of them,

* Ephes. i. 17, 20; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Acts iv. 27; x. 38.

were a manifestation in Him of the Spirit of God. His life was wisdom, energy, goodness, love; Divine wisdom speaking with human lips; Divine energy working with human hands; Divine goodness animating a human character; Divine love pouring forth its tenderness and its fulness, its sympathy and its grandeur, in human self-sacrifice and tears, and agony and death. What a manifestation! What a man! He was what he was—leaving all other men at awful distance—because the Holy Ghost abode upon him, guided him, sustained him, quickened him. We do not affect to measure by human thoughts, to define in human words, the *Divine Humanity*. For here we are not sitting as speculators in a school of disputation, but kneeling as worshippers in the temple of the Eternal.

III. There are various works of the Spirit of God in man, which do not renew, purify, and save them.

(1.) *Extraordinary power for the accomplishment of extraordinary undertakings*, has been vouchsafed to men; and this extraordinary power is attributed in Scripture to the Spirit of God. “And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, See, I have called by name Bezaleel the son of Uri, the son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah; and *I have filled him with the Spirit of God*, in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship to devise cunning works, to work in silver and in gold and in brass, and in cutting of stones,

to set them, and in carving of timber, to work in all manner of workmanship.”* — When Moses was overwhelmed with the burden of “all this people,” and complained in the bitterness of his soul to God, “the Lord said unto Moses, Gather unto me seventy men of the elders of Israel, whom thou knowest to be the elders of the people, and officers over them, and bring them into the tabernacle of the congregation, that they may stand there with thee. And I will come down and talk with thee there: *and I will take of the Spirit that is upon thee, and I will put it upon them*, and they shall bear the burden of the people with thee, that thou bear it not thyself alone.”†

It is said of Saul, “when he had turned his back to go from Samuel, God gave him another heart, and all those signs came to pass that day; and when they came thither to the hill, behold, a company of prophets met him, and *the Spirit of God came upon him*, and he prophesied among them.” “The Spirit of Jehovah came upon Gideon, and he blew a trumpet, and Abiezer was gathered after him.” “Then the Spirit of the Lord came upon Jephthah, and he passed over Gilead and Manasseh.” “The Spirit of the Lord came mightily on Samson.”‡

If, in these passages, express mention had not been made of “the Spirit of God,” we might

* Exod. xxxi. 1—5.

† Numb. xi. 16, 17.

‡ 1 Sam. x. 9, 10; Judges vi. 34; xi. 29; xiv. 6; xv. 14.

have spoken of the natural or acquired ability, the genius, or the valour of these persons, as fitting them, respectively, for the construction of the tabernacle, and for the government of the people. The ability or genius of these chosen persons is here ascribed, however, to “the Spirit of God.” You may resolve this phraseology, if you please, into what is called a Hebraism. *The facts are Hebraisms as well as the words.* It was the habit of the Hebrews to speak of the Divine agency in a manner which has become obsolete—except sometimes in poetry, in prayers, and in sermons—because it was an essential part of the history of the Hebrews to be familiar with modes of Divine agency which have accomplished their purpose, but which not a few in modern times disbelieve and even ridicule, because they have ceased to be exhibited. The ascription of the skill of Bezaleel to the Spirit of God, and of the magisterial aptitude of the seventy elders, to “the Spirit that was put upon them,” is no more a *bare form of speech*, than the ascription of the plagues of Egypt, the passage of the Red Sea, and the supply of food and water in the wilderness, to the peculiar manifestations of the power of God. The superhuman is as clear in the one set of instances as in the other; so clear, indeed, that the same interpreters who profess to explain the agency of the Spirit here spoken of by the native talent of the men, attempt to explain the miracles in all the other cases by the ordinary course of nature. Such

expounders of the Scriptures betray but a slight perception of the only design which is worthy of a revelation; they shew little sympathy with the *religious tone* of these sacred writings; less discernment of the extraordinary occasions for which extraordinary powers were needed; and less still of the comprehensive and devout judgment which sees the profound analogies and the exquisite proprieties which distinguish all the works of God: retiring within themselves and their own experience, they imagine that there is no truth, no God, beyond the narrow orbit which their intelligence illumines; and they, forsooth, are theologians, the interpreters of the oracles of God!

(2.) *Divine knowledge, and special modes of attesting Divine truth*, have been imparted to men, and such endowments are expressly ascribed to the Holy Spirit.

It is with a becoming sense of dependence and obligation that we ascribe all the endowments of the human intellect, its treasures of knowledge and wisdom, to the benignity of God. This is the course of nature. We owe it to the good pleasure of God that we are men, in distinction from the inferior races of creatures; by the same good pleasure, one man is raised above another in his capacities, in his propensity to mental culture, and in the opportunities and inducements by which his faculties are brought out and improved. "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and

cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness nor shadow of turning.”* Shall we ascribe to Him the lights of the firmament, the dews, the showers, the fruits of the earth, the fulness of the deep, “the chief things of the ancient mountains, and the precious things of the lasting hills” — and shall we not also acknowledge as from Him the piercing intellect, the capacious memory, the strong judgment, the clear and tranquil reason, the bright imagination, the courage, the wisdom, or the eloquence, by which men are raised like the stars of the morning above the horizon, gilding with their glory the memory of successive ages?

Who will say that Plato and Leibnitz, Newton and Milton, were not made to differ from the millions of forgotten men, by the living Spirit whose “inspiration giveth understanding unto all men?” And yet there was nothing supernatural in these,

“ the great of old,
The dead, but sceptred sovereigns, who still rule
Our spirits from their urns.”

They were neither prodigies nor miracles: they were men; men whom God enriched with rare perfections for the benefit of others, not as

* James i. 17.

deities to be adored, but as priests—lowly ministers amid their fellow-worshippers at the footstool of our common Father.

We read in Scripture of gifts beyond the course of nature, whereby men have been marked out as the special messengers of God in the revelation of His truth. It has been attempted to generalize these gifts, so as to include them in the same class with those which are natural. Instead of denying the inspiration of apostles and prophets, it has become the fashion of a modern school to assert that wisdom, goodness, truth, religion, are common to man; that the prophets are “men of religious genius;” that every man in his degree is inspired; that Minos and Moses were inspired to make laws, David and Pindar to write poetry; that Newton and Isaiah, Leibnitz and Paul, Phidias and Mozart, “receive into them various forms of the one spirit from God most high;” that “Habakkuk speaks in his way and Hugo de St. Victor in his;” that Elisha, Böhme, and Bunyan were alike “filled with a soul wide as yesterday, to-day, and for ever;” that John the Baptist, Socrates, *Jesus*, and Justin, and John Huss, are “among millions of hearts stout as theirs—as full of God.” This, we are told, is “the only kind of inspiration possible.” It is described as co-extensive with the faithful use of man’s natural powers. Men may call it miraculous, but nothing, we are assured, is more natural; or they may say it is entirely human, for it is the result of man’s use of his faculties; “it is

the belief of all primitive nations that God inspires the wise, the good, the holy ; that this inspiration is limited to no sect, age, or nation. It is wide as the world, and common as God.—It is not given to a few men, in the infancy of mankind, to *monopolize inspiration*, and to bar God out of the soul.—You and I are not born in the dotage of the world. Now, as in the days of Adam, Moses, Jesus, he that is faithful to reason, conscience, and religion, will, through them, receive inspiration to guard him through all his pilgrimage.”*

In this mode of representing the matter there is an apparent charm of simplicity. We have no objection to acknowledge that it contains a portion of truth. Inasmuch as it traces all genius, knowledge, and goodness ultimately to God, and exhibits His providence in the ordering of the spiritual, not less than the material, world, we can have no quarrel with such opinions, or with those who propagate them. But, seriously, is it put forth as a truth to be received by religious men, that Minos and Moses were on the same level ; that David and Pindar enjoyed the same inspiration, Pindar as really as David, David not more really than Pindar ; that the reasonings of Newton are analogous to the messages of Isaiah ; that Leibnitz and Paul were instructed after the same fashion ; that the ancient seer of the Hebrews, and the

* A Discourse on matters pertaining to Religion, by Theodore Parker. Book III. c. 8.—Emerson's Orations, Lectures, and Addresses. See Appendix, Note F.

contemplatist of the middle ages, derived their visions from the same source; that the prophet of Judæa, the fanatic of Germany, and our own Bunyan, were alike taught of God; that “millions of souls have been as full of God” as Jesus? Is it an ascertained and proved truth that the faithful use of man’s natural faculties is the only inspiration possible? To affirm the impossibility of any inspiration beyond the natural reach of the human faculties, is to presume that he who makes the affirmation has meted out the immeasurable power of God. To say that no higher inspiration has ever been afforded, is to reject the most authentic history in our possession, and to overlook the sublime discoveries, the accomplished series of prophecies, the recorded miracles, the authoritative power, of the only documents in religious literature which have stood the tests of criticism in all time.

When we study the sacred documents, we observe that in their descriptions of God there is an awful sublimity, a reverent familiarity, an intrinsic truthfulness, for which we look in vain to other writings, excepting as those other writings have been borrowed from the Scriptures. The delineations of man in these writings have anticipated the universal testimonies of ages in every land. The spirituality of mind, the purity of heart, the humility, the benevolence, the devotion, the peace, the superiority to the power of temptation and to the fear of death, which have ever accompanied the prac-

tical belief of the Bible, are never found among men who are destitute of such belief.

Then there are some *singularities* inwrought into the very texture of these writings, which cannot fail to strike the careful and candid student of them, as placing them in a rank which stands alone, above comparison with our merely human productions.—The first of these singularities is, the early, long-continued, and gradually developed scheme of prophecy which is embodied in the Scriptures. Not forgetting the larger sense in which the term prophecy is used throughout the Old and New Testaments as including every kind of instruction directly conveyed from God to man, we now use it in its restricted application to the *foretelling of future events*, events neither involved by necessity in known physical causes, nor rendered morally certain, that is, in the highest degree probable, by frequent and familiar analogies. The distinct foreknowledge of the general course of things; of the history of separate, combined, or successive nations; of the circumstances of particular families; of the actions of free agents; of the birth, character, history and death of One Man; of the exact condition of cities and countries in remote ages:—this is as inconceivable in relation to man, as it is consistent with our notion of God. Yet the Scriptures abound with the most accurate proofs of this knowledge beforehand. Some of the prophecies, regarded by themselves, are said to be obscure in their reference; but the symbols in which they

are clothed can be understood by long, careful, and well-directed study: others are as explicit and direct as any passages in history. Some prophecies, relating to the same times, persons, and events, are given separately and successively, by different prophets. Some referred to events close at hand; and, by receiving their accomplishment, they proved the prophet's inspiration in a very brief time; while others pointed to the distant future, awaiting their fulfilment through the slow march of many changes in the affairs of mankind. We need no very profound search into the depths of Hebrew prophecies to see that, while distinct portions of them related to various minor ends, those ends themselves, like the actual course of Providence on which their light was flashing, were all subservient to a higher, an ultimate object — the very object that was announced in the earliest of them all: "the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head." While the immediate design of one prediction is to animate Hope, of another to awaken Fear; while the sweetest strains of consolation are poured on trembling spirits, guarded by burning words of wrath against idolatry and sin; while some relate to temporal things, and others to those which are eternal: all conspire in making known to man the Secret Things of God, bringing Him near to our thoughts, touching us with a mingled sense of the majesty of His government, and of the tenderness of His compassion; and the wonder of the

whole is, that all the parts of this system, scattered as they are, and incoherent as they may appear to the superficial, are harmonized into plan and unity by their reference to One Person. That One Person was to be the Seed of the woman, of Abraham, of Judah, of David; the rejected of his own people; the lawgiver of nations; the conqueror of the world; and, though dying in poverty and weakness and shame, the founder of an unchanging monarchy.

That the oldest Hebrews themselves regarded this One Person—the Anointed One—as the scope and centre of their prophecies, is well understood; and it is equally well understood that the New Testament writers follow out their Divine Master's sanction of this view, by uniformly representing all prophecy as fulfilled in the character, the death, and the victories of Jesus of Nazareth. The extent of time to which the course of prophecy is thus shown to refer, the slow but steady rising of this “light shining in a dark place,” the magnificence of Him in whom everything meets, and the sublimity and permanence of the purpose to be accomplished, were beyond the range of the human faculties; and, according to our conception, they agree with nothing else than with the belief that Prophecy was the inspiration of Omniscience.

The second of these singularities is—that this vast scheme of prophecy is inlaid upon the tablet of Hebrew history and institutions. This indisputable fact made the events of that history the vouchers

for the prophetic inspirations. It also made the singular and complex institutions of that people the symbols of a coming order of things, which, besides being too spiritual for a mere man to have invented, was too comprehensive for a Hebrew to have admitted. Amid a secluded people of narrow views, of imperfect morals, and scanty literature, whose social and religious polity was of a specially local character, there arose a succession of men who unfolded prospects interesting the entire human race, irradiating all time with visions of the highest virtues, and the noblest triumphs. What was there in the Hebrew institutions to promise the realizing of such visions? Was there not everything in the national feelings and in the religious prejudices of the people to prevent it? Surely there is here something beyond "religious genius," higher than philosophy, of a totally different character from merely human poetry. An unbelieving reader may see no more in the Bible than the fool, or the speculative atheist, sees in the material universe. But as, to the thoughtful observer, the heavens and the earth are full of the glory of creating power, so, to the devout reader, the Bible is full of the glory of eternal wisdom.

The third of these singularities is — that the scheme of instruction unfolded in these documents is accompanied by a series of works which attest that the teachers of religion were superhumanly endowed, and miraculously sent forth, by God. The evidence of this is plain. It is as really historical

as that on which we rest our belief that the Persians were driven by the Greeks from Marathon, or that Cæsar conquered Gaul. No theory of *Myths* can destroy the positive testimony in the one set of cases, more than in the other. There is no rational accounting for the institutions of the Hebrews without acknowledging the Divine mission of Moses. There is no feasible explanation of the origin of Christianity without acknowledging the Divine mission of Jesus. No intelligent and consistent account can be given of the ascertained reception of the Gospels among millions of men in the second century, which is not built on the acknowledgment that their historical truth had been proved by a sufficient number of competent witnesses in the first century. Taking these writings, then, for what they profess, and have been shown to be—historical documents—it is worthy of your attention to observe that you cannot separate the human from the superhuman, the ordinary from the miraculous, without denying facts which stand on the same kind of evidence—only more full, more exact, more thoroughly sifted—with all that is received and acted on, by intelligent and practical men, as authentic history. Relying, for the present, on the well-considered grounds on which these observations are made, we may assume, merely as historically true, that Moses led the Israelites from Egypt through the Red Sea, and that he gave them laws, and governed them in the Arabian desert for forty years. *Could*

he have done these things by the mere force of human genius? Assuming, in like manner, the historical truth of the transactions recorded of Elijah,—the ordinary transactions we mean,—*could* he have succeeded as he did, if he had had nothing to sustain him beyond the power of his own mind? Assuming, also, the historical truth of the life and death of Jesus, without—if that be possible—thinking of the miracles ascribed to him,—*could* he have said what he said, could he have founded that system of belief and worship which neither the superstition nor the presumption of man has been able to destroy? *Could* he, a Jewish peasant, have so eclipsed the wisdom of the wisest, and defied the power of the mightiest, enlightening the darkest, and raising the most debased of human kind, if God had not been with him, *as he never was with any other man*? Assume the historical truth that Paul and Peter and other men preached the gospel, and planted churches in Judæa, Galilee, and Samaria, in Syria, in the various countries of Asia Minor, in Greece, in some of the Ægean islands, in Italy, in Spain, within less than thirty years after their Master's death. *Would* they have done this, if they had not been convinced that what they said of him was true, and if they had not known that He had given them their commission *after* his death and after his resurrection? *Could* they have persuaded sensible men, brought up in bitter prejudice against all they taught, to believe that what they said was true, if they had not been able to

say things, and to do things, beyond the reach of human intelligence and human power? Are such things so common—such men, such teaching, such mental and moral revolutions—in the world, that you can coolly place them beside the productions of genius, and the triumphs of art? Is there not a difference—a *felt* difference—between these works and all other works, between these histories and all other histories, whether ancient or modern, whether true or false? Has the literature of the world displayed even the imagination of a man that can, for a moment, be compared with Jesus Christ?

Now let us examine the report which these extraordinary men give of their visible superiority to other men.

What does Jesus say of himself?—"And they said unto him, Who art thou? And Jesus said unto them, Even the same that I said unto you from the beginning. I have many things to say and judge of you; but He that sent me is true; and I speak to the world those things which I have heard of Him. They understood not that he spake unto them of the Father. Then said Jesus unto them, When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am *he*, and that I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things. And he that sent me is with me: the Father hath not left me alone; for I do always those things which please Him."*

* John viii. 25—30.

On a later occasion, he says — “I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment what I should say and what I should speak. And I know that His commandment is life everlasting; whatsoever I speak, therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak.”*

To Philip, who said to him, “Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us,” he answered, “Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself, but the Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works.”† To his Father he appealed in his solemn prayer, when he took leave of the disciples, “I have given unto them the words which thou gavest unto me, and they have received them, and have known assuredly that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me; I have given them thy word.”‡

What do the disciples say of Jesus? “No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.”§ What was the acknowledgment of Nicodemus, evidently speaking as the representative of a class? “We know that thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can do these miracles that thou doest except God be

* John xii. 19.

† John xiv. 14.

‡ John xiv. 10.

§ John i. 18.

with him.”* And what is the truth which he avows to Nicodemus? “Verily, verily, I say unto thee, We speak that we do know, and testify that which we have seen, and ye receive not our witness. If I have told you of earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things? And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, the Son of man which is in heaven.”†

What is the record of John? “He that cometh from heaven is above all, and what he hath seen and heard, that he testifieth; and no man receiveth his testimony. He that hath received this testimony hath set to his seal that God is true; for he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God; for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him.”‡

How is he spoken of by that apostle who builds the truths of the Gospel on the foundations of the ancient church? “God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last times spoken unto us by His Son.” §

Attend to the manner in which the Son of God assures his disciples that they should be fitted for the mission on which they were to be sent: “The Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say.” || “The Comforter,

* John iii. 2. † John iii. 11—13. ‡ John iii. 31—34.

§ Heb. i. 1. || Luke xii. 12.

which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father shall send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you. The Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of me. He will guide you into all the truth. He will shew you things to come. He shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you.” “Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.” “Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you.”*

These things are to be kept in remembrance when we read in the New Testament such declarations as the following:—“They were filled with the Holy Ghost, they began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance.” “My speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man’s wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit, and of power; that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.” “God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit, for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.” “Now we have received not the Spirit that is of the world, but the Spirit which is of God: which things also we speak, not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth.”† “Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. The manifestation

* John xiv. 26; xv. 26; xvi. 13, 14; Acts i. 5, 8.

† Acts ii. 4; 1 Cor. ii. 4, 5, 10, 13.

of the Spirit is given to every man to profit with. All these worketh one and the self-same Spirit." "How shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious?" "I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord." "I certify you, brethren, that the Gospel which was preached of me, is not after man; for I neither received it of man, neither was I taught, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." "By revelation he made known unto me the mystery." "Ye received it not as the word of man, but (as it is in truth) the word of God." "He therefore that despiseth, despiseth not man, but God, who hath also given unto us his Holy Spirit." "The things that are now reported unto you by them that have preached the Gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven." "The word of the Lord endureth for ever; and this is the word which by the Gospel is preached unto you." "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches."*

From these clear attestations of the supernatural endowments of Jesus, and of his apostles, we may understand the meaning, and perceive the authority, of what is said by them, of the writings of the Old Testament. "How doth David by the Spirit call him Lord?" "If he called them gods,

* 1 Cor. xii. 4, 7, 11; 2 Cor. iii. 8; xii. 1; Gal. i. 11, 12; Eph. iii. 3; 1 Thess. ii. 13; iv. 8; 1 Pet. i. 12, 25; Rev. i. 10; ii. 7.

unto whom the word of God came." "Which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." "Who by the mouth of his servant David hath said," "Well spake the Holy Ghost by Isaiah the prophet unto our fathers." "To them were committed the oracles of God." "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some should depart from the faith." "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you; searching what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify." "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."* The same style of language was used in the Old Testament itself. We read of "men of God," "holy men of God." They came with the declaration, "Thus saith the Lord." Their messages are, "The word of the Lord," "The Spirit spake by them."

Will men of fair mind examine these singularities in the structure of our Sacred Writings and in the history of the original teachers of our religion, and say that nothing but an antiquated prejudice could prompt us to maintain that these teachers had endowments for their work which

* Matt. xxii. 43; John x. 35; Acts iii. 21; iv. 25; xxviii. 25; Rom. iii. 2; 1 Tim. iv. 1; 1 Peter i. 10, 11; 2 Peter i. 21.

were totally different from those of human genius or industry, and which we find attributed in the Holy Scriptures to the Holy Ghost? We do not say, nor believe, that these extraordinary endowments renewed the minds, purified the characters, or saved the souls, of the men who possessed them. They were not given for this purpose. They were not of a nature to effect this purpose. Though it may be true, in general, that the men who received such unusual powers for the doing of an unusual work were, also, partakers of personal holiness and salvation, we have clear and ample proof that there might have been, and probably were, numerous exceptions. The examination of these exceptions is not the least part of our object in the present argument; for they place before us in the simplest and strongest manner the distinction which we must observe, the real and essential distinction, between being superhumanly endowed for a particular work, and being a partaker of “the renewing of the Holy Ghost.”

Observe the plain and forcible language of Jesus, in which the distinction we are now concerned to hold is pointed out:—“Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.” “Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name; and in thy name have cast out devils; and in thy name have done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew

you ; depart from me, ye that work iniquity.”* We see plainly that a man might prophesy, cast out dæmons, and do wonderful works, in the name of Jesus, and yet be a worker of iniquity ; one whom Jesus never approved, never loved.

The same distinction is made by the apostle Paul, when he says, “Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, a tinkling cymbal : and though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge ; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing.”† A man, therefore, might be endowed with all those spiritual gifts (χαρίσματα) by which the Spirit of God testified of Christ and glorified Him, and *yet not be a Christian*.

The most patient and often repeated examination of the language of the sixth chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews, has convinced us that it is on the same principle that we are to explain the following verses :—“For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, *and the powers of the world to come*, if they shall fall away, to renew them again to repentance.”‡ We are certain that such persons will not be saved. The apostle contrasts them with those of whom he

* Matt. vii. 21—23. † 1 Cor. xiii. 1, 2. ‡ Heb. vi. 4—6.

is “persuaded better things,”—better than being enlightened, better than having tasted of the heavenly gift, better than being “partakers of the Holy Ghost,” better than tasting of the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come,—even “things which accompany salvation.” They are the gifts which our Lord showed that men might have and yet be “workers of iniquity,” never known by him; the same things which the apostle taught the Corinthians that a man might have, and yet be “nothing.” The Hebrews addressed in this epistle were familiar with the cases of persons who possessed these endowments. The apostle employs terms corresponding to the terms here employed, for the purpose of designating such persons—prophesying, understanding all knowledge, and all mysteries, receiving the Holy Ghost, speaking with the tongues of men or of angels, having the faith which removes mountains. The peculiar advantages possessed by such gifted persons for being assured of the truth and divinity of the gospel, shows how it would be “impossible” for any means to succeed in bringing them to repentance, if they once cast away the profession and belief of the gospel as true. And yet their possession of these endowments was, in itself, no security for their possessing “better things,” and being “not of them that draw back unto perdition, but of them that believe unto the saving of the soul.”

(3.) Men are addressed by divine truth as the means of moral suasion; and the effects which that

truth produces on their minds are attributed to the Holy Spirit. Whatever effects are produced by any truth, may properly and rationally be ascribed to the person who presents the truth, and still more properly and rationally to Him from whom it originally proceeds. All truth believed becomes the view which he who believes it takes of the objects which that truth respects. Until a man believes a truth, views things according to that truth, he either takes no view at all, thinks not of such things, or he takes other views, believes something else. Now a large portion of the truth taught in Scripture is taught in the way of appeal to recognised convictions. There is great power in the mode of presenting these things in Scripture, in the evidence which the Scripture gives of their reality, and in the associations by which they are made to act on men's natural hopes and fears, to quicken their attention to them. The conscience of man, his reason, his affections, his dread of dishonour and of punishment, his desire of glory and happiness, his benevolent propensities, his calculations of interest, his perceptions of the true, the beautiful, the right, and the good, may be wrought upon so as to produce deep and lasting effects upon his mind, and upon his character. Multitudes who believe little more of Christianity than the moral truths which it recognises, *but which are not its peculiar and characteristic discoveries*, are trained up in the exemplification of all the personal and social virtues which adorn and sweeten human inter-

course. Hence it is that the awful allusions to the Divine omniscience and justice, to death, judgment, and eternity, which pervade the Scriptures, and which are simply and earnestly exhibited in good popular preaching, in stirring treatises and tracts, or in the private remonstrances of religious persons, have great power over the minds of all who believe, or who even fear, without fixedly believing, that these things are true. They trouble many consciences. They darken many hearts. They weaken the force of many temptations. They correct the tone, and purify the tastes, of society. They foster morals. They secure a habit of attending to what is believed to be religion. They bring persons into a state of mind which often, though not always, issues in the “renewing of the Holy Ghost.” You can scarcely suppose a person receiving as true the descriptions of Divine goodness and compassion, and especially the simple narrations of the life and death of Jesus, without being moved by them. They awaken our admiration. They win our confidence. They keep men from despair. In other words, he who regards these descriptions and narrations as true, is moved in a way in which he would not be moved, if he did not think of them as true. In like manner, the higher doctrines of Christianity respecting sin, the Saviour, the way in which pardon may be obtained, and heaven secured, cannot become a man’s own views, without producing convictions of unworthiness, a sense of the need of forgiveness,

an acknowledgment of the Saviour's dignity and love, and a desire to partake of eternal life. It is because of the power which there is in the gospel to excite such thoughts and such desires that it has been revealed.

For these purposes it is preached. We know of no other means of producing the same effects. He who tells a man the truths of the gospel, produces these effects on his mind, whenever he succeeds in gaining that man's attention to them as true. But inasmuch as they are truths which were originally taught by the Holy Spirit, it is as right to ascribe these effects on the human mind to the Holy Spirit, as it is to ascribe any other benefits bestowed on us by our fellow-creatures to the providence of God. The truth of the gospel is from the "Spirit of truth." The power of the gospel is "the power of the Holy Ghost." Whether a man's mind is enlightened and moved by direct inspiration, or by the words of men inspired, it is the Spirit of God that enlightens him. That men have been, and are now, thus enlightened, is a matter of familiar and undoubted experience.

With this particular view of the work of the Holy Spirit as the Teacher of divine truth, we can have no difficulty in perceiving the force and the application of several passages of Scripture which appear to have been grossly misunderstood, and somewhat warped for the unhappy purposes of sectarian controversy. We read in Genesis (vi. 3), "And the Lord said, My Spirit shall not always

strive with man, for that he also is flesh; yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years." We may pass by the rabbinical interpretations of this remarkable passage, of which some explain the word "spirit," as the human spirit which God had put into man, and which he threatens to withdraw by death, and others as God's Spirit within himself, no longer hesitating between judgment and mercy. Taking the words "my spirit" to mean, "the Spirit of God," as we have been accustomed to understand that designation, the question is, what is that which the Spirit of God had been doing, and which it is here threatened he will cease to do? The answer to this question depends, partly, on the meaning of the Hebrew word which is translated "strive," and partly on the references to this portion of the sacred history which we find in other parts of Scripture.

1. The word here translated "*strive*" does not suggest, in its radical signification, or in the modifications with which it occurs in Scripture, the class of ideas suggested by the word "strive." These ideas relate to a struggle, an effort against some opposing force or contrary effort. That the Spirit of God strives with men in this obvious and commonly received sense of the word, may or may not be true; but a competent Hebrew scholar, we believe, would scarcely affirm that any work of that kind is described in this particular passage. The word פָּנָה means to *judge, plead, control*; and in this place it would seem to signify—"My Spirit shall

not always judge man, control him, warn him, condemn him, and plead with him."

2. The word which in other parts of the Old Testament is translated "strive" is a totally different word, *רִיב*.

3. There are several passages of Scripture in which the Spirit of God is represented, on the one hand, as testifying against the sins of men, and men, on the other hand, are represented as rejecting, resisting, rebelling, and striving against the testimony of the Holy Spirit in the ministry of his inspired messengers.

The reader of the Old Testament is familiar with the strong and cutting reproaches addressed to the Hebrew people by Moses, by the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah, and Ezra, as a stiff-necked people, stiff-hearted, refusing to hear the words of God. How many of the discourses of Jesus are burdened with upbraidings of their obstinacy! How fearfully does the martyr Stephen press the same accusation on the consciences of the enraged crowd that stoned him to death!*

* Josephus, their own historian, says of them, referring to the time in which they were favoured with the ministry of the Messiah, and of some of his apostles: "I think that had the Romans delayed to come against these wretches, the city would have been swallowed up by an earthquake, or overwhelmed by a deluge, or experienced the same doom as Sodom; for it bore a more impious generation than those which suffered such things. Nor was there ever, from the beginning of the world, a generation more prolific in wickedness."—*De Bel. Jud. lib. v. c. xiii. sect. 6, c. x. sect. 5.*

“They refused to hear him, and pulled away the shoulder, and stopped their ears, that they should not hear! Yea, they made their hearts as an adamant stone, lest they should hear the law, and *the words which the Lord of hosts hath sent in his Spirit* by the former prophets.” “Yet many years didst thou forbear them, and testifiedst against them by *thy Spirit*, in thy prophets; yet would they not give ear: therefore gavest thou them into the hand of the people of the lands.” “Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the *Holy Ghost*: as your fathers did, so do ye.”*

4. The antediluvian age, to which the passage under consideration belongs, is referred to as being “condemned” by Noah, who was a “preacher of righteousness.”†

5. “By the Spirit, Jesus went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing.”‡

By first studying each of these particulars, and then comparing them together, we arrive at the true solution of the question now before us. The Spirit of God, in *the ministry of Noah*, preached righteousness, testified against evil, warned men of the consequences of their wicked courses: and it is here distinctly threatened that *this dispensa-*

* Zech. vii. 11, 12; Nehem. ix. 30; Acts vii. 51.

† Heb. xi. 7; 2 Pet. ii. 5.

‡ 1 Peter iii. 18—20.

tion of truth and forbearance shall cease. It did cease. That generation was destroyed. So it has ever been. So will it be until "the mystery of God is finished." Wherever the inspired teacher lifted up his voice, wherever the written or uttered words of such teachers are addressed to men, there the Spirit of God is, fulfilling His sacred mission as a teacher. Remembering, as we ought, that we cannot flee from the Spirit now, the guilt of slighting or rejecting His instructions is aggravated, doubly aggravated by the majesty, condescension, and grace with which He stoops to teach us, and by the Presence in which that grace is outraged.

The entire history of revelation, and of its treatment by mankind, illustrates the character of this appeal of the Spirit of God to human minds. It is the manifestation of truth. It is a declaration of authority. It is the display of mercy and long-suffering. It treats men as rational beings, endowed with conscience, and capable of being swayed by considerations addressed to them as reasonable motives. When men plunge so deeply into the world, become so absorbed in the visible, the present, the transient things of this life, as to have neither leisure nor inclination to attend to "what the Spirit saith," no excuse can screen them from the charge of doing "despite unto the Spirit of grace." He spake; but they would not hear. He taught; but they would not learn. He warned them; but they heeded not. He reasoned with them, expostulated with them, brought before them

the treasures of infinite love, and encompassed them with the light of heaven; but they went on their way—the way of business, of ambition, of pleasure, leaning to their own understanding, and blindly imagining that they were strong enough, or good enough, to find eternal happiness:—victims of their own wilfulness—they perish.

Thus we become disentangled from the distressing questions—“Is the Spirit of God resisted? Is the grace of God received in vain?” There is but one plain unsophisticated answer to these questions. The Spirit of God is resisted. The grace of God—his favour and benignity embodied in the gospel which “bringeth salvation”—*is* received in vain. But innumerable instances are continually occurring in which it cannot be truly said that the Spirit of God, as an objective teacher, is entirely resisted, that no good effects are produced by His teaching. In our Lord’s deep and pregnant parable of the sower there were not only those who are compared to the falling of seed by the wayside which is picked up or trodden down, but also those who are like the falling of seed in stony places, where there is “not much earth,” “no deepness of earth,” who “receive the word with joy,” but having no root in themselves endure for awhile; and those, too, who are as the seed falling among thorns, which “spring up and choke them,” being rendered unfruitful by “the cares of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches;” and then, again, there are those who are like the

falling of seed into good ground, inasmuch as they hear the word and understand it, and, receiving it into an honest and good heart, bring forth fruit with patience.

In like manner, the teaching of the Holy Spirit by the word of God is not entirely neglected, and lost, by all to whom it comes. Multitudes are awakened and moved by it. Like Herod who heard John gladly, and did many things, or like Felix who “trembled,” or like Agrippa who was “almost persuaded to be a Christian,” they acknowledge and feel the living power of the truth; they avoid many sins, practise many moral virtues; and they display much earnest regard for religious doctrines and customs, though they are not “renewed in the spirit of their minds,” are not “children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.” That such persons should “fall away,”—“believe for a season”—sin wilfully after they have “escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,”—be “again entangled therein, and overcome, and the latter end be worse with them than the beginning;” that, not being “partakers of the Divine nature,” they should lack the things which make men to be “neither barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ,” and be “blind, and unable to see afar off, and forget that they were purged from their old sins:”—all this is, indeed, mournful as well as criminal, perplexing as well as monitory; but it is, in all respects, consistent with the freedom of

human agency ; and the blame of it rests, not on the feebleness of the work of the Spirit, but on the obstinacy and perversity of man.

Let us not forget, however, that there are those who heartily receive the truth which the Holy Spirit teaches. They believe it ; they love it ; they cling to it ; they follow its light, enjoy its consolations, bring forth its precious fruits in a holy, spiritual, and useful life ; and they die in the full assurance of its hopes. To such persons the Holy Spirit is really and practically an external Guide and Comforter. They acknowledge Him as such. They “mind the things of the Spirit,” and to them this is “life and peace.” They know Him and love Him. Between such persons and all other persons, there is a real difference, broad, palpable, infinite. We do not know that there is anything in man’s consciousness that would of itself explain the cause of this difference. We are not able to affirm, or to perceive, that the human consciousness goes out beyond its own states and its own acts to recognise the *causes* of those states and acts. So far as we can gather, the human mind is not conscious, strictly speaking, of any other agency than its own. But when he who believes what the Spirit says, does what the Spirit by the word requires to be done, and rejoices in the fulfilment of the promises which the Spirit has given, contrasts his present with his former self, and compares his own spiritual condition with that of others to whom the Spirit had

addressed precisely the same teaching, it is not likely that either his reason or his conscience, either his humility or his gratitude, will allow him to ascribe this sublime and blessed difference to causes lying wholly in himself. We presume that, independently of any express revelation on the subject, his judgment and his feeling would prompt him to ascribe it to some mysterious and gracious working of that Spirit with whom he knows that he is brought into wonderful and glorious communion. We conceive that a law of life so powerful and so happy brings with it the conviction of its Divine origination, springing up, not from corrupt and fallen nature, but from the eternal Fountain of good.

We shall proceed, in the next lecture, to examine what the Spirit Himself has taught in relation to this particular question of the beginning of the spiritual life in man. We are now merely illustrating the position—that the intellectual perceptions, the moral processes, and the beneficial practical results, which flow from Christian teaching, are due essentially to the work of the Holy Spirit.

To deny this, is to deny one of the plainest doctrines of the Scriptures. Nor can it be denied on any principle which does not carry in it the denial of a Divine agency in any part of the universe. It is a portion of the work which the Spirit came into the world to do, and which He has been doing ever since He came.—We cannot

but lament that a truth so plain, so important, carrying with it appeals so commanding, and so touching to all the springs of human feeling, and all the principles of man's activity, should at any time appear but faintly on the surface of our popular theology. And we do lament, not less poignantly, that in the more intellectual and scholastic modes of treating questions of theology, so many powerful and accomplished thinkers have exhausted their precious toil on the human and inferior elements employed in the propagation of the truth. It may be well that the skill and earnestness and faithfulness of ministers and other teachers should be acknowledged. It may be well that the *language* of Moses and the prophets, of the evangelists and apostles, should be examined and expounded with whatever resources the most exact and elaborate learning can command. It may be well that the intrinsic truthfulness, the rationalness, the harmony with physical science and sound metaphysical deductions, of the truths revealed in Scripture, should be soberly and strongly demonstrated. But, assuredly, it is *not* well for men to forget, or even seem to forget, that all the value, authority, and power, of scriptural teaching are owing to the fact that here pre-eminently, and after a fashion which is unique, the Holy Spirit is the teacher.

We acknowledge that even the most vivid remembrance of this fact—namely, that the Spirit of God is the foundation of all religious truth—does

not of itself secure that "holiness without which no man shall see the Lord." Nevertheless it is a truth. It is a truth of deep and sacred meaning. It is one of many truths respecting the Spirit of God. It is clearly revealed. It is an article of the Christian faith. It is fruitful in results. So long as we hold fast this truth, we are safe from manifold aggressions on the stability of our religious convictions. It clothes our thoughts with awe and seriousness. It hushes the sound of levity. It rebukes the sin of unbelief. It surrounds the gospel with the majesty of the Godhead. It raises the teachings and the promises of Scripture to a level which is as far above all human teaching and all human assurances as heaven is higher than the earth.

It is *the* peculiarity of Christianity. Not the faithfulness of the evangelist,—not the genius, and wisdom, and experience of the apostle,—not the poetry and eloquence of the prophet,—precious and undying as these characteristics are to the enlightened reader—not any nor all of these have given to our sacred records the stamp which separates them from every other production of the pen of man, but "the Spirit" who guided them into all the truth, and thus filled them with His own presence, that they might become the unerring teachers of salvation to every people.

LECTURE III.

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE SALVATION OF MAN.

“THE RENEWING OF THE HOLY GHOST.”—Titus iii. 4, 5.

WE now proceed to examine what the Scriptures teach concerning the work of the Holy Spirit of God in actually saving man.

We shall, *First* :—COLLECT AND CLASSIFY THE PRINCIPAL TESTIMONIES OF SCRIPTURE RESPECTING THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT.

Secondly :—GATHER FROM THESE SCRIPTURES A CONNECTED VIEW OF THE TRUTHS THEY DIRECTLY TEACH, OR OBVIOUSLY IMPLY.

Thirdly :—SHEW THE HARMONY OF THE TRUTHS SO TAUGHT WITH SOME OTHER TRUTHS OF HUMAN CONSCIOUSNESS, OR OF DIVINE REVELATION.

Fourthly :—ADVERT TO SOME FACTS, ILLUSTRATIVE OF THESE TRUTHS, FROM THE HISTORY OF MAN IN GENERAL, AND OF THE CHURCH IN PARTICULAR.

FIRST :—We shall collect and classify the principal testimonies of Scripture, respecting the work of the Spirit. It may be convenient to arrange these testimonies in the following order :

I. THERE ARE PRAYERS AND OTHER EXPRESSIONS OF DEVOTIONAL SENTIMENT RELATING TO THIS WORK. “Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me. Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy Holy Spirit from me. Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation, and uphold me with thy free Spirit.”* The same Psalmist says again, “Teach me to do thy will; for thou art my God: thy Spirit is good; lead me into the land of uprightness. Quicken me, O Lord, for thy name’s sake.”†

The apostle Paul thus prays for the Romans:—“Now the God of peace fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, through the power of the Holy Ghost.”‡

He prays also for the Corinthians:—“The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen.”§

And for the Ephesians he thus prays:—“Wherefore I also, after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus, and love unto all the saints, cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers, that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Him; the eyes of your understanding being enlightened, that ye may know what is the

* Psa. li. 10—13.

† Rom. xiv. 13.

‡ Psa. cxliii. 10, 11.

§ 1 Cor. xiii. 14.

hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints, and what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe.”*

And again, for the same people:—“For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, that He would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man, that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God. Now unto Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto Him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end. Amen.”†

II. THERE ARE PROMISES RELATING TO THIS WORK.—There are promises in the old covenant, which look forward to the new covenant. “Until the Spirit be poured upon us from on high, and the wilderness be a fruitful field, and the fruitful field be counted for a forest. Then judgment shall dwell in the wilderness, and righteousness

* Eph. i. 15—19.

† Eph. iii. 14—21.

remain in the fruitful field. And the work of righteousness shall be peace; and the effect of righteousness, quietness and assurance for ever.” “Yet now hear, O Jacob, my servant, and Israel, whom I have chosen; thus saith the Lord that made thee, and formed thee from the womb, which will help thee: Fear not, O Jacob, my servant, and thou Jesurun, whom I have chosen. For I will pour water on him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground; I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring; and they shall spring up as among the grass, as willows by the watercourses. One shall say, I am the Lord’s; and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob; and another shall subscribe with his hand unto the Lord, and surname himself with the name of Israel.” “As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord: my Spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed’s seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever.” “And I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them an heart of flesh; that they may walk in my statutes, and keep mine ordinances, and do them, and they shall be my people, and I will be their God.”*

* Isa. xxxii. 15—17; xliv. 1—5; lix. 21; Ezek. xi. 19, 20.

“Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments and do them.”—“And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh.”—“And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Spirit of grace and of supplication; and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first-born.” *

The testimony of John involves the promise: “I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear. He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost.” †—Hear the words of Jesus to the crowd, assembled to celebrate the Feast of Tabernacles at Jerusalem: “In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink. He that believeth

* Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 27; Joel ii. 28; Zech. xii. 10.

† Matt. iii. 2.

on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive; for the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified.”* Hear how he expostulates with his disciples: “If ye, then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children; how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him!”† Observe how he addresses his sorrowing followers, when the time of his departure from them was drawing nigh: “If ye love me, keep my commandments. And I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him: for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. I will not leave you comfortless. I will come to you. But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said to you. But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, He shall testify of me. Nevertheless I tell you the truth. It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I

* John vii. 37, 39.

† Luke xi. 13.

depart, I will send him unto you. And when He is come, He will reprove (convince) the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged. I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when He the Spirit of truth is come, He will guide you into all (the) truth; for He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak, and He will show you things to come. He shall glorify me: for He shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine; therefore said I that He shall take of mine, and show it unto you.”* See how the apostle Peter expounds the great promise of the Spirit, and the wonders of the day of Pentecost: “Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.”†

III. THERE ARE DOCTRINAL STATEMENTS, AND PRACTICAL EXHORTATIONS AND ALLUSIONS, RELATING TO THIS WORK.

In his discourse with Nicodemus, Jesus answered,

* John xiv.; xv.; xvi.

† Acts ii. 38, 39.

“Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit.” *

Hear how he addresses the mixed multitude at Jerusalem: “No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man, therefore, that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me.” †

How copious and varied is the testimony of Paul in his Epistle to the Romans: “The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto us.” ‡ “There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death; . . . that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For they that are after the flesh do

* John iii. 5—8.

† John vi. 44, 45.

‡ Rom. v. 5.

mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit. For the minding of the flesh is death; but the minding of the Spirit is life and peace. Because the carnal mind (the minding of the flesh) is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be: so then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by (or because of) His Spirit that dwelleth in you. For if ye live after the flesh ye shall die; but if ye, through the Spirit, do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby ye cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God. . . . Ourselves, also, which have the first-fruits of the Spirit, groan within ourselves . . . Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities, for we know not what we should pray for as we ought, but the Spirit itself maketh

intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And He that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because He maketh intercession for the saints, according to the will of God.” “For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.” “That the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost.” “Now I beseech you, brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ’s sake, and for the love of the Spirit, that ye strive together with me in your prayers to God for me.” *

See how the same apostle reasons with the Corinthians: “Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. But he that is spiritual judgeth (discerneth) all things; yet he himself is judged (discerned) of no man.” “Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?” “What! know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, which is in you, which ye have of God?” “But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by

* Rom. viii. 1—27; xiv. 17; xv. 16, 30.

the Spirit of our God.” “Now He which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.” “Ye are our epistle, written in our hearts, known and read of all men; manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ, ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God, not on tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart.” “How shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious?” “Now the Lord is that Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord (is) there (is) liberty. But we all with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.” “Now he that hath wrought us for the self-same thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit.” *

The same apostle thus teaches the Galatians:—
“Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?” “That we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.” “And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.” “But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born of

* 1 Cor. ii. 12, 14, 15; iii. 16; vi. 19; 2 Cor. i. 21, 22; iii. 2, 3, 8, 17, 18; v. 5.

the Spirit, even so it is now.” “For we, through the Spirit, wait for the hope of righteousness by faith.” “This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would. But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law. . . . The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance; against such there is no law. If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit.” “He that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting.” *

Observe the strain of his epistle to the Ephesians: “In whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance, until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of His glory.” “For through Him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father.” “In whom ye also are builded together, for an habitation of God through the Spirit.” “Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.” “Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption.” “The fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness, and

* Gal. iii. 2, 14; iv. 6, 29; v. 5, 16—25; vi. 8

righteousness, and truth.” “Be filled with the Spirit.” *

To the Philippians he says: “I know that this shall turn to my salvation through your prayer, and the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ.” “If there be, therefore, any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of the Spirit, fulfil ye my joy.” “We are the circumcision, which worship God in the Spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh.” †

He recognises this work in writing to the Colossians, when he says: “Who also declared unto us your love in the Spirit.” ‡ He reminds the Thessalonians of their blessed privilege: “Ye became followers of us and of the Lord, having received the word in much affliction, with joy of the Holy Ghost.” “He that despiseth, despiseth not man, but God, who hath also given unto us His Holy Spirit.” “God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the truth.” §

The same doctrine is taught by Peter: “Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.” “Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love

* Eph. i. 13, 14; ii. 18, 22; iv. 3, 30; v. 9, 18.

† Phil. i. 19; ii. 1; iii. 3.

‡ Col. i. 8.

§ 1 Thess. i. 6; iv. 8; 2 Thess. ii. 13.

of the brethren, love one another with a pure heart fervently." "That they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the Spirit." "The Spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you." *

This doctrine respecting the Spirit is reiterated by John: "But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things." "Hereby we know that He abideth in us, by the Spirit which He hath given us." "Hereby we know that we dwell in Him, and He in us, because He hath given us of His Spirit." † The same truth is insisted on by Jude: "These be they who separate themselves, sensual, not having the Spirit. But ye, beloved, building up yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost, keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ, unto eternal life." ‡

IV. THERE ARE FACTS NARRATED IN RELATION TO THIS WORK, IN THE PLANTING OF THE FIRST CHURCHES BY THE APOSTLES. After the descent of the Spirit at Jerusalem, on the day of Pentecost, it is said: "The Lord added to the church daily such as should be (or were) saved." "And believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes, both men and women." Peter declares to the council at Jerusalem: "We are witnesses of these things, and also *the Holy Ghost*, whom God

* 1 Pet. i. 2, 22; iv. 6, 24.

† 1 John ii. 20; iii. 24; iv. 13.

‡ Jude 19—21.

hath given to them that believe.” After Saul’s conversion we are told: “Then had the churches rest throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria, and were edified; and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, were multiplied.” Of the preachers from Cyprus and Cyrene, at Antioch, it is recorded: “The hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number believed and turned unto the Lord, and,” it is added, “Barnabas saw the grace of God.” “Long time therefore abode they (Paul and Barnabas) in Iconium, speaking boldly in the Lord, which gave testimony unto the word of his grace, and granted signs and wonders to be done by their hands.” Of the first convert in Europe it is said: “And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshipped God, heard us: whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul.”*

SECONDLY:—FROM THESE TESTIMONIES OF HOLY SCRIPTURE, LET US GATHER A CORRECT VIEW OF THE TRUTHS WHICH THEY DIRECTLY TEACH, OR OBVIOUSLY IMPLY.

I. *These Scriptures teach us the abiding presence of the Spirit of God in the spirit of man:* not His presence in that sense in which He is everywhere, as the sustainer and ruler of either the physical world, or the moral system; nor in that sense in which we may affirm that wherever the word of

* Acts ii. 47; x. 14; v. 32; ix. 31; xi. 21, 23; xiv. 3; xvi. 14.

God is, there is the Spirit, who inspired that word; nor in that sense in which by sympathy and by active imagination, one man's spirit may be said to be present with another man's spirit:—it is His presence peculiar to this particular case; by virtue of which it is true of the believer of the Gospel, as it is not of any other man, or any other being, that he has the Spirit,—that the Spirit is in him,—abides in him,—dwells in him,—works in him,—is *shed abundantly upon him*, that he may be renewed and saved. The presence of the Spirit is not, cannot be, recognized otherwise than by the effects which he produces: it is only by producing effects that the presence of God manifests itself in any department of his mysterious agency. The *Shechinah* in the temple, the *glory dwelling between the cherubim*, is thought to have been not a visible splendour, but an unseen presence, manifested by sound rather than by sight.* Most assuredly it comports neither with the attributes ascribed to the Holy Spirit, nor with what we know of the spirit of man, to imagine that there can be any intuition, perception, feeling or consciousness of His presence, apart from those holy and gracious results which we are taught in the Scriptures to ascribe to that presence.

II. *The ever-present Spirit of God produces in the spirit of man those happy effects which, taken together, may be expressed by the one word—*

* See Heber's Bampton Lectures, Lect. iv. p. 245, and Note G. at p. 276—282.

salvation. By an agency which does not, cannot, destroy the freedom, the spontaneous and natural acting, of the human spirit, the Spirit of God becomes, in that spirit, the author of a new and spiritual life,—the source of strength, of knowledge, wisdom, spiritual perception, and discernment; of practical attention to the Gospel; of obedience, growth in grace, and conformity to the image of the Lord; of contrition; of peace and joy in believing; of quietness, and assurance of Divine love; of attraction to the Saviour; of unity and affection among Christians; of tenderness and purity; of devotion and usefulness; of goodness, truth, long-suffering, gentleness, meekness, and self-government.

III. *This abiding presence producing these gracious results, constitutes the personal difference between him who is saved, and them who are condemned.* They in whom the Spirit of God is belong to Christ. They, and none else, are the children of God. They, and none but they, are believers, holy persons, Christians. They, and they only, are “saved” by “the mercy of God,” “are justified by His grace,” and “made heirs, according to the hope of eternal life.” We are not to seek the marks of salvation in any outward standing by which we may be thought to be related to the church, nor in any speculative opinions. They are not to be found in inward impulses or impressions. They lie in the personal character, in the spiritual character. They must

be traced in that image of God which His Spirit renews in us—"knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness." We "must be born again." "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away, behold, all things are become new." "By this we know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." This is CHRISTIAN SPIRITUALISM. It is not secured by intellectual refinement, or by moral culture, by abstractions, imaginations, or formularies, but by the Spirit of the living God abiding in us, to guide us in the path of self-denial, holiness, and love. It is life. It is growth. It is power. It is liberty. It is conflict, ending in victory. It is God, manifested in man. It is grace, enabling humility to abase pride; conscience to subdue lust; faith in the unseen to overcome the visible; the future to control the present; and the spirit of man to triumph over the flesh: raising a man from the debasement and bondage of sin to real dignity and true freedom; and fitting the child of earth to be a partaker of the joys of heaven.

Without discarding the aids of philosophy, of education, of mental discipline, and moral training, for their appropriate uses, its roots are deeper, its branches are wider, its fruit is more precious and enduring than the highest aims of any of them, or of them all. Far from discouraging watchfulness, it is that alone which ensures it, and makes it successful. Instead of quenching the desires, or checking the utterances, of prayer, it is the very

element of prayer, prompts it, explains it, justifies it, answers it. Never raising us above the use of those means by which piety is nourished, and faith made strong, it is the vital principle which absorbs and assimilates every truth into the spiritual system, and stamps on every habit the seal of immortality. It is in a high and sacred sense *THE LIFE OF JESUS made manifest in our mortal flesh*. It is the likeness of the Son of God, not portrayed by human limner, or carved by earthly sculptor; but drawn by his own Spirit in the living organism of a spiritual man.

By the coming together of separate spiritual men, the church is builded, a living temple, a “habitation of God through the Spirit.” The Church of God is not a human corporation, a visible institution, or a kingdom of this world: it is a spiritual organization, the handywork of the Holy Ghost; only the spiritual can belong to it; only the spiritual can discern it; only the spiritual can obey its laws, enjoy its immunities, or discharge its functions. From within itself, by the power of the indwelling Spirit, guiding each member “according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body, to the building up of itself in love:”* it “grows up into a holy temple in the Lord;” “a spiritual house; a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.”†

* Eph. ii. 20—22; iv. 7—16.

† 1 Pet. ii. 5.

By the laws of his intelligent nature, a man may acknowledge the force of evidence. He may admire much of what is lovely in Christianity, by reason of his moral sympathies. He may conform to many of the outward usages of Christians from the law of habit, or from erroneous or superstitious motives. By all that he perceives of the intellectual splendour, the moral purity, the sentimental elevation or tenderness of the religion of Christ, he may be deeply interested, or even filled with delight. He may be an able and successful teacher of what he thus perceives and feels. But it is the Spirit of Christ in a man's own spirit that makes him a Christian; and, having made him, keeps him so. The power which makes and keeps men Christians, is the only power that can increase the church. It was so at the beginning. So it must continue till the end. As we dare not ascribe to human reasonings the authority of divine truth, neither can we expect from human agencies the results of divine grace. Men may exalt their own capacities and prerogatives according to their fancy; they may dignify their functions by sacred names; they may wield what influence these assumptions have given them over the prejudices of the ignorant, the infirmities of the weak, the fears of the timid, or the ambition of the strong: but names are not things; pretension is not truth; opinion is not faith; the system of man is not the religion of God. We repair to Christ's own testimony as given, according to His promise, by His holy Spirit, to learn what

Christianity is. In that testimony we learn that it is the life of God in the spirit of man: a life as distinct from the moral life, as the moral life is distinct from the intellectual, or the intellectual life from the animal: that life of which Christ is the normal type, and of which the Spirit of Christ is the author and the sustainer. It is not vouchsafed according to moral laws, which are known and appreciated; but according to a higher law of grace, which has not been revealed to man—"the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus." It belongs not to the department of governing men, but to the department of *saving* them. It is a divine agency which we cannot understand, because it bears no analogy to any other agency with which we are familiar. It is revealed as fully, as explicitly, as any other truth respecting God. It is a truth believed. The reason for believing it is God's own testimony. "Our faith stands not in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God."*

By the results produced, the presence of the ever-working Spirit of God is made known. Thus the facts of spiritual experience confirm the truth of divine teaching; and we find THE DOCTRINE OF REVELATION TO BE IN HARMONY WITH THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF MAN. A believer knows that he believes. The child of God knows that he calls God—Father! He has *in himself the witness* of his faith. His humble penitence; his lively trust in

* 1 Cor. ii. 5.

Christ; his love; his resignation; his spiritual desires and affections; his struggle against temptation; his abhorrence of sin; his devotion to his Saviour; his delight in heavenly things; his self-denial; his watchfulness; his aspirations after higher purity; his preparations for celestial blessedness;—all these vital pulsations, and healthy movements of his spiritual nature, agree with the doctrines which he believes. He cannot ascribe them to himself; for he knows that *by nature* he is one of “the children of disobedience, even as others.” He is taught that he is “saved by the renewing of the Holy Ghost.” The testimony in the divine book accords with the testimony in the divine work. The witnesses are distinct, yet they agree. What the Holy Spirit says, in the word, respecting His own work in the spirit of man, is realised in the actual history and progress of the spiritual man. From his own consciousness, the Christian learns to infer the consciousness of others who, like himself, are “partakers of the Divine Nature.” To such persons the writers of the New Testament appeal, as we have seen, in the general tenour of their spiritual instructions. And to such persons, it must be very clear, such appeals as abound in the Evangelical Epistles have a meaning and a power; while to other men, even the “wise and prudent,” they are but foolishness and weakness. We need not marvel that only Christians can understand and appreciate Christianity. It is not strange surely, that, as in all the practical affairs of life, the affairs of

religion should exhibit much of what, to the uninitiated and inexperienced, is inexplicable, and what their ignorance may reject as worthless, or ridicule as absurd. "Other systems are easiest in theory. The mind, in speculation, runs smoothly over their different parts, they fit into each other elaborately, and the whole work appears highly finished. But bring them into practice, and the charm is immediately dissolved. There all their difficulties begin; *and there the difficulties of Christianity all end.* Whatever difficulties have been suggested with regard to Christianity, they are entirely speculative; they were made by men who had no mind to practise the religion they opposed. But none who with intelligence have brought Christianity to bear on life, have ever complained that they found any blank in its action, or any of their wants unfurnished. If acting, they were abundantly supplied with strength; and if suffering, with consolation."*

IV. *The possession of this distinctive personal character is to those who do possess it the pledge of endless happiness and glory.* In the language of our Saviour's promise, "everlasting life" is the portion "of the believer."† "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out. For I came down from heaven not to do mine own

* The Truths of Religion. By James Douglas, Esq. Second edition, p. 299.

† John iii. 16; v. 24.

will, but the will of Him that sent me. And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. And this is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on Him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day." "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me. And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all: and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand. I and my Father are one."*

The apostles express themselves in accordance with the connexion affirmed by their Divine Master. "We believe," says Peter, "that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved." And Paul thus testifies in all his epistles. To the Romans: "Hope maketh not ashamed, because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." "Being now justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him. For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life."† To the

* John vi. 37—40; x. 27—30.

† Acts xv. 11; Rom. v. 5, 9, 10.

Corinthians : “ God hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.” “ We have the first-fruits of the Spirit.” To the Galatians : “ We, through the Spirit, wait for the hope of righteousness by faith.” “ He that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting.” To the Ephesians : “ God hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ; according as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love, having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of His will, to the praise of the glory of His grace, wherein He hath made us accepted in the beloved.” To the Philippians : “ Being confident of this very thing, that He which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ.” “ In nothing terrified by your adversaries, which is to them an evident token of perdition, but to you of salvation, and that of God : for unto you it is given, in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on Him, but also to suffer for His sake.” To the Colossians : “ Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light ; who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into

* 2 Cor. i. 22 ; Rom. viii. 23 ; Gal. v. 5 ; vi. 8 ; Eph. i. 3—6 ; Phil. i. 6, 28, 29.

the kingdom of His dear Son.” “Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory.” To the Thessalonians: “What is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye, in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at His coming? For ye are our glory and joy.” “God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with Him.” “Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God, even our Father, which hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation and good hope through grace, comfort your hearts, and stablish you in every good word and work.” “The Lord is faithful, who shall stablish you, and keep you from evil.”*

To Timothy: “God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind.” “I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day.” “I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love His

* Col. i. 12, 13; iii. 3, 4; 1 Thess. ii. 19, 20; v. 9, 10; 2 Thess. ii. 16, 17; iii. 3.

appearing.” “And the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom.” To Titus: “Paul, a servant of God, and an apostle of Jesus Christ, according to the faith of God’s elect, and the acknowledging of the truth which is after godliness: in hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began.” “Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.” “That being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.” To the Hebrews: “Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.” “These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things, declare plainly that they seek a country . . . But now they desire a better country, that is a heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God; for He hath prepared for them a city.”*

Thus James likewise teaches: “Of his own will begat He us, with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of His creatures.” “He that converteth the sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins.” Observe how amply this truth is unfolded by Peter: “Blessed be the God

* 2 Tim. i. 7, 12; iv. 7, 8, 18; Tit. i. 1, 2; ii. 13; iii. 7; Heb. xi. 1, 13, 14, 16.

and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time." "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." "Rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that when His glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy." "If these things be in you and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. . . . Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things ye shall never fall; for so an entrance shall be ministered to you abundantly, into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." "We, according to His promise, look for a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."*

See how largely and with what richness of language it is taught by John: "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when He shall appear, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is." "Whosoever is born of God

* James i. 18; v. 20; 1 Pet. i. 3—5, 23; iv. 13; 2 Pet. i. 8—11; iii. 13.

doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.” “And hereby we know that we are of the truth, and shall assure our hearts before him. For if our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things. Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God. And he that keepeth His commandments dwelleth in Him, and He in him. And hereby we know that He abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us.” “And we have known and believed the love that God hath to us.” “God is love; and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him. Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment; because as he is, so are we in this world. There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear: because fear hath torment.” “This is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life: and he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life. These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God.” “We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not; but he that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not. And we know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness. And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that

we may know Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life.”*

The happiness and glory which God has prepared and promised are represented, in these passages of the New Testament, as the gift of His grace in Christ *to all those in whom the Holy Spirit dwells and works*. Such is the end in which His work receives its consummation. Now the consciousness of possessing the character which is the effect of the Spirit's working, brings with it the assurance of eternal bliss. Provision is thus made against despondency on one side, and against presumption on the other. For who can despond, when the Divine Comforter is present with him,—that Comforter who is at once the WITNESS of his adoption, — the SEAL of his acceptance, — the EARNEST of his redemption,—the FIRST-FRUITS of the glorious liberty of the sons of God? And who that studies these oracles of God, will dare,—without the Comforter—the Witness—the Seal—the Earnest—the First-fruits,—to presume that he shall be a partaker of the felicity which is to come? Indeed we cannot study these numerous and concurrent testimonies of inspiration without observing, that the happiness secured to the spiritual children of God is not a happiness reserved for that state of being which is yet future. It is a hope, yet a fruition. It is that which shall be hereafter, yet

* 1 John iii. 2, 9, 19—24; iv. 17, 18; v. 11—13, 18—20.

that which is already. The spiritual life, and joy, and honour, which are to be continued and perfected in the world to come, are imparted in the present world. The germ is given when men are "born of the Spirit." It is the "seed which remaineth"—the "Spirit that abideth in us."

The progressive attainment of spiritual intelligence, purity, strength, and gladness, technically called sanctification, is a discipline which prepares for the heavenly state; yet it *is* that state itself: elementary and imperfect indeed, but the same in principle and in kind which is to be developed in a fulness and maturity to which we can assign no limits, since they shall continue to advance for ever. The fact that this preparation is known by personal consciousness to be going on, agrees with the teachings of the infallible word; expounds their meaning; and, sustained by that word, carries in itself the confidence that the work will not be abandoned by Him who has begun it. It is of the very nature of this spiritual process that its reality should be manifest in proportion to its vivacity and depth; so that he who has now the strongest symptoms of that life which is to be perpetuated in heaven, enjoys the brightest, as well as the sweetest, hope that heaven will be his home.—It is also of the nature of this work to increase the humble reliance of the Christian on the work of Christ, as the only basis of his safety, the only warrant for his confidence. The farther he recedes from that sinful state from which the Spirit of God has raised

him, the clearer is his perception, and the deeper his sense, of the grand evangelical truth that he is "justified freely by the grace of God, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." The more truly holy he becomes, the more simply and earnestly does he renounce all dependence on himself, either for righteousness or for strength : this is not merely a conviction of the judgment ; it becomes a sentiment of the heart. The whole work is one of progress. Knowledge of spiritual things increases. Delight in spiritual things becomes purer. The energy of the inner man grows stronger. All the means of spiritual self-culture and improvement are used more sedulously, and with more success. Prayer,—meditation,—the study of Divine truth,—fellowship with other spiritual minds,—activity in diffusing the knowledge, and exemplifying the power, of the gospel,—have less in them of the constraint of duty, less of the inconstancy of weakness ; and they acquire the vigour and endurance of established habits. The whole tendency of the whole man towards God becomes more decided, more orderly, and, not unlike the gravitation of bodies towards their centre,—more rapid. There is more and more of that serene and spontaneous conformity to the laws impressed upon our being, which alone deserves the name of happiness.

Two things only are needed to secure the perfection of this happiness—the removal of the spiritual man from earth to a more congenial

state, and the renovation of his corporeal nature by the promised resurrection.

The entire history of the Christian illustrates the scriptural statements which warn him against the vanities of earth, the seductions of the flesh, the many temptations to evil which always beset, and often harass, him, while here; and all the longings of his renewed spiritual nature vibrate to the assurance of a higher condition of existence. To that condition he is introduced by death. His spirit joins "the spirits of just men made perfect," is "absent from the body, present with the Lord," departs to be "with Christ, which is far better." Freed from the thralldom of the flesh, and from all the holdings of "the present evil world," his companions are spirits like himself; his works such as only spirits do; his joys such as none but spirits know.

The final consummation is yet future. There shall come to pass the full meaning of the sayings: "If the Spirit that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you;" and this also, "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body; and so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam (is) a quickening spirit."* We

* Rom. viii. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 44, 45.

know by experience what is meant by a *natural body*. We do not know by experience what is meant by a *spiritual body*. By describing incorruption, glory, and power, as the attributes of the spiritual body, the apostle suggests all that it is possible for us, in our present state, to conceive on the subject. The "earthly mortal body, which is, as it were, only the seed-corn that is laid in the earth, is subject to corruption, to dishonour, to weakness; the body of those raised up, on the other hand, shall be endued with immortality, glory, and power. All these points of contrast are ultimately brought together in the words, 'It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body.' What is subjected to earthly death, is only the soul-body, the principle of natural life: at the coming of Christ, however, it will be raised a spirit-body. Of this latter, Paul gives only, as it were, a negative representation: he furnishes no positive conception of it, but contents himself with indicating that it is of a higher nature than the physical or natural body." * The natural (or psychical) body, is a body animated by the vital principle which men have in common with the lower animals, furnished with organs of perception, and sustained by elements from without. The *spiritual* body would therefore seem, by the contrast which the apostle suggests, to be a body adapted to the higher action of spiritual natures,

* Billroth on 1 Corinthians, *in loco*.

unsuited to the region of earth, and, unlike the psychical body, not dependent on outward elements for its support.*

This spiritual body, *made like unto our Lord's glorious body*, and animated by the enlightened, purified, and perfected spirit, which has been made what it becomes by the indwelling Spirit of God, will, we humbly presume, be for ever the temple of the Holy Ghost. Thus the union of the believer with Christ is completed: he is "joined to the Lord," and is "one spirit" with Him; the SPIRIT in Christ is, at the same time, the SPIRIT in the believer: Christ and the believer are spiritually one. When that believer receives the "spiritual body," the union is made visible; it is "the manifestation of the sons of God:" the body of the redeemed will be, in all things, like the body of the Redeemer. *That* will be the "building of God, the house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens: for in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven, if so be that, being clothed, we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life. Now he that hath wrought us for the self-same thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of His Spirit."†

* See Rosenmüller, Scholia in Nov. Test., *in loco*.

† 2 Cor. v. 1—5.

Beyond this our faith proceeds not. It is a theme too high for uninspired imagination. Our reverence forbids our speculating. "It doth not yet appear what we shall be." But our likeness to our Lord in spirit now, assures us that we shall be like Him in body hereafter. The spiritual likeness is a matter of consciousness now. The bodily likeness, together with the spiritual likeness, will be a matter of consciousness hereafter, and without end.

We have endeavoured to compress within these narrow limits the principal aspects of that truth which the Scriptures uniformly reveal to us respecting the "renewing of the Holy Ghost," as accomplishing the salvation of man; and we have, also, endeavoured to show how far the truth thus revealed is reflected in the mirror-like consciousness of Christians as they are described, and dealt with, in the New Testament.—It is in no slavish or unreasoning mood that, in these endeavours, we appeal, first of all, to every intelligent reader of the Scriptures, and say, "Is it not thus written?" To this inspired standard we bring every human judgment. From this divine fountain we have drawn, or at least sought to draw, whatever we hold as truth upon this subject. If the Scriptures are not of final authority in this matter; if we have unwittingly misapprehended their plain grammatical meaning; or if we have deduced from them more or less than they contain, then it is our infelicity to be teaching error: in that case, blessed be he who, in the spirit of

love, and faithfulness, and wisdom, shall convince us of the error, and lead us to the truth. But if it be admitted—as, in our belief, there are solid and irrefragable reasons for admitting—that the prophets and apostles, and above all, their great Master and their theme, were superhumanly endowed with the Spirit of God; and if, notwithstanding our ignorance and imperfection, we have honestly, and in the main, correctly exhibited what they were inspired to teach, then have we found what we felt to be needed, and what we have been engaged in seeking,—God's testimony to His own work in the salvation of men.

Assuming that there is no essential error in the representation of this work which we have deduced from Scripture, to what can we appeal for its *subjective truth*, but to the consciousness of spiritual men, the inward apprehension and experience of those who, in this respect, are like the Christians to whom the apostles wrote? It is for them to say, whether the effects which we ascribe to the Holy Spirit are such as correspond with their own spiritual history. By their principles, affections, and habits, they are witnesses for the Holy Spirit, even as the Spirit, in the declarations of His word, is a witness for them. They are God's "workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works."* Their good works, connected with the principle and the

* Eph. ii. 10.

power by which they are wrought, are the signs of the presence of the Holy Spirit, "bearing witness with their spirit" that they "are the children of God."

THIRDLY:—LET US EXHIBIT THE HARMONY OF THESE TRUTHS RESPECTING THE HOLY SPIRIT WITH OTHER TRUTHS MADE KNOWN BY HUMAN CONSCIOUSNESS, OR BY DIVINE REVELATION.

We have purposely laid the foundation of these Lectures in the consciousness of man: not merely from a conviction that such is the only method of procedure by which we can arrive at truth in relation to the spiritual nature and the spiritual history of man, but also because this is the method sanctioned by Him who is at once our Creator and our Teacher, in His holy word. Truth relating to spiritual things can be apprehended only by beings who have a spiritual capacity; and by them it is apprehended only in that degree in which they withdraw their attention from the material and outward, to the inward and spiritual. Whether this has been done, and, if done at all, to what extent, by the founders and the followers of prevailing theological systems, is no part of our present business to determine. It can scarcely be unperceived by educated and thoughtful persons, that the greater part of theological systems are based on received metaphysical principles; and even those which appear to be guided merely by the letter of the Sacred Books, faithfully interpreted by approved philological methods, are evermore influenced,—we will not say biased,—in their interpretation, by

foregone conclusions on the subjects to which the several contents of the Sacred Books refer, especially that large class of subjects which relate, more or less directly, to the attributes and workings of the mind of man. Nor, indeed, do we see how this could be avoided, the human mind being what it is. It seems to be a law of that mind,—a mode of acting we mean, which, being natural, is inevitable,—to throw the shadow of its own thoughts, its own convictions, its own avowed or undetected system, on all that it contemplates; to regard everything, and every view of things, in their relation to itself; and, most emphatically, to judge of all that is spiritual by what it knows of its own states, and its own powers. How can it be otherwise with regard to that department of divine truth which professedly treats of the spiritual powers and the spiritual states of man?

I. The work which we believe to be ascribed in Scripture to the Holy Spirit *does no violence to the conscious freedom and activity of man's spiritual state*. The Scripture nowhere represents the Spirit of God as *forcing* the spirit of man. Such an idea could not be entertained by a mind that reflects on the settled meaning of these words: a spirit *cannot* be forced; the terms are contradictory. The animal powers of man may be overborne by power of the same kind superior to itself. His intellectual power may be shut up to a given conclusion, by the strength of a clearer or more robust understanding. His affections may be irresistibly moved in a

direction, and to a degree, which are determined by another. But the spirit is essentially free. Take away the freedom, and you take away the spirit. To speak of spontaneous action which is forced, of choice which is, from without, necessitated, is to use words which have no meaning. What the Spirit of God does in man, He does in accordance with man's nature.* Is it unnatural for man to believe the true? to love the right? to choose the good? to worship Him who made him? to accept the highest benefits? to seek the purest happiness? to desire, and prepare for, immortal honour and felicity? If not, how can it violate his nature, his freedom, his activity, if the Spirit of God does that—call it by what name you will—which *results in his doing these things?* That this work can be done, is the teaching of the Scriptures, and also that it *has* been done by the Holy Spirit. That it is still done, that the results are continually produced, is testified by the consciousness of every Christian. We compare the Divine teaching with the human consciousness, and we find that they agree. So simply spontaneous are the faith and love and practice of the Christian, that he has no conception of even the possibility of its being otherwise than spontaneous. His wonder is, his pain, his grief, is, that he ever thought, felt, or acted differently, in relation to his spiritual duties and interests. It is his amazement and his disappoint-

* See Howe's Living Temple, part ii. c. ix.

ment, that he should fail to persuade others to think, feel, and act, as he now thinks, feels, and acts himself. He is taught, indeed, that a "good work" has been "begun" within him; but he does not know by his own experience, or by his own reasonings, what that work is, or how it is: he knows only that what the Gospel declares to be the effects of that work, are the things which constitute his own experience. .

We acknowledge that speculative reasoning has given another aspect to this question. Our answer, however, to such reasoning is, that its premises are abstract notions; they are not facts.—Arguments founded in the supposed analogies of external nature contravene our conclusion. We meet such arguments by denying that there is any analogy between the physical and the spiritual. They are not analogous; they are opposites. What is true of the one, is not true of the other. Vital energies, it is well known, counteract chemical tendencies; spiritual energies overcome physical forces.—We are not unmindful of modes of stating ordinary or extraordinary facts in the spiritual history of man, which have the appearance of inconsistency with the perfect freeness of spiritual agency. Too well we know that—the whole man considered—there is a state which is felt to be thralldom; that in the mysterious transition from that state to one of perfect spiritual freedom, there is a struggle to be maintained; and that this struggle is maintained by eminent Christians to the very end of life; but

the work of the Spirit of God consists in emancipating the spirit of man from that thralldom: the struggle is maintained by "the spirit against the flesh," and "by the flesh against the spirit;" and it is only when the Spirit of God has conquered "the flesh," and given perfect freedom to "the spirit of a man which is in him," that this gracious work in him is accomplished. The imperfect comprehension, and the inadequate language, of men respecting the great change that passes over them, in their conversion to God, are not to be taken as accurate representations of that which they really experience. Just conceptions of man's spiritual nature are not essential to conversion, or to any of its antecedents or results; though they *are* requisite in describing them. We are not surprised that the notorious Earl of Rochester, for example, should speak of feeling "an inward force upon him, which so enlightened his mind, and convinced him, that he could resist no longer: for the words (of the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah) had an authority which did shoot like rays or beams in his mind, so that he was not only convinced by the reasonings he had about it, which satisfied his understanding, but by a power which did so effectually constrain him, that he did ever after as firmly believe in his Saviour as if He had been seen in the clouds."*

Here was the struggle of the unbelieving mind

* Some passages in the life and death of John, Earl of Rochester, by Bishop Burnet.

against truth, overcome by that clear evidence which alone could naturally overcome it; and, like everything in that well-known narrative, this exhibits the internal proof of truthfulness, in its exact agreement with the laws and conditions of the human mind.

When Christians have spoken or written of *feeling* a power, which they ascribe to the Holy Spirit, while we do not question the reality of that which is to them a fact of consciousness, we may question the correctness of the language they employ for the purpose of recording that fact. Consciousness, from its distinctive nature, *can* relate only to the mind's own states and acts. All beyond is either intuitive perception, conjecture, argument from some premises, or faith in some testimony. In recording the facts of their consciousness, few men, perhaps none, confine themselves to the bare statement of that which their consciousness infallibly attests, and against which there can be no valid reasoning: they blend with the fact their judgment, or their belief, of the external cause, against which judgment or belief there *may* be valid reasoning. They express themselves, not infrequently, in the language of Scripture, which, being the language of a divine revelation, expresses more than can be known by the mere consciousness of man.

We do not pretend to give such a representation of the work of the Spirit of God in man as shall, in all respects, conform to the known laws of human consciousness. This would be beside

the question now before us, beyond our province, and above our power. Of the Spirit's agency, man cannot be directly conscious. Of our own perceptions, affections, and acts, we are conscious. The perceptions, affections, and acts, which are held forth in Scripture as the consequences of the Spirit's working, are known to be as free, spontaneous, and agreeable to the laws of our active spiritual nature, as if no such working had taken place.

Theological writers of different schools have disputed whether this grace, or work of the Holy Spirit, is *irresistible*. In this dispute much needless confusion of thought has arisen from not observing the precise sense in which this scholastic term is intended. That which is irresistible is *superior to all opposition*: opposition is, by the nature of the case, excluded. When the intellectual faculties of man are addressed by truths and reasons, those truths and reasons may be resisted or opposed by false judgment and by inclination. When his moral powers, his conscience, and his will, are addressed by objective motives, those motives may be opposed by pre-existent dispositions and habits. Whatever the Spirit of God does by either of these methods, by the instructions, exhortations, and commands of revealed truth, has been thus opposed, as we learn both from Scripture and from experience; and the pertinacity of that opposition is a fearful aggravation of the guilt of sin. But when the Spirit of God quickens, renews, re-

generates, and produces the results which are described in Scripture as sanctification, the change produced in man is one deeper than his consciousness; it is beyond the range of opposition; it is the removal of *that* in him which is the source of all opposition to the truth and love of God. So, at least, we understand the language of the Scriptures; and to this understanding of the Scriptures, we find nothing contradictory in the consciousness of those who are the subjects of renewing grace. We believe that, in relation to this particular work of the Holy Spirit, the notion of resistance is as inapplicable as it would be to the beginning of animal life, or of intellectual consciousness.* That the work is done, and that it is not resisted, we are plainly taught in Scripture; and what Scripture teaches is confirmed by the consciousness of every Christian.

II. It is further to be shown that the work of the Holy Spirit *does not oppose any principle, or law, of the government of God*. The only principles, or laws, of the divine government with which the work of the Spirit, as we have been representing it, can be supposed to be at variance, are these two: first, that each man endowed with the capacities and furnished with the means of moral agency, is responsible to God for his voluntary actions: and, secondly, that the consequences (whether rewards or punishments) of moral actions shall attach to the agent.

* See Appendix, G.

(1.) That the work of the Spirit, as we have viewed it, does not oppose the first of these laws or principles, the following considerations may suffice to show.

The responsibility of man is involved in that view of his state which has become the occasion of the Spirit's interference. If he was not a sinner, he would not need to be renewed in the spirit of his mind; if he were not, by the perversion of his nature, so thoroughly and habitually addicted to sin that there is no hope of his abandoning it, while he is left to himself, he would not need to be renewed by the Spirit of God. Before the Spirit of God renews him, then, he is responsible. After the Spirit of God has renewed him, his responsibility for his own voluntary acts continues. He is as amenable as he was before, to the judgment of his own conscience, and also to the just judgment of God. To imagine that a sinner is not responsible *until* the Spirit of God renews him, is to imagine something which is contradictory alike to the constitution of man, his consciousness, his judgment of himself and of other men, and to the express assertions and the constant implications of Scripture. The injudicious language sometimes used to describe the weakness and wretchedness of fallen man, the unscriptural straining of scriptural metaphors, and the rhetorical exaggerations which push grave truths beyond their just limits, have too successfully nurtured the vicious indolence of men, and encouraged the dreamy notion that, even

though they would, they cannot do the things which they know they ought to do, and which God has commanded them to do. A not less deplorable consequence of this erroneous judgment and bad taste, embodied in a false theology, is—that men of too much discernment, and too much reverence for moral principles and requirements, to be led away by the error we have now exposed, have confounded the false theology with the true, by applying to the true the objections which have no bearing but upon the false. Yet we ask candid and thoughtful men to consider, calmly, whether they can detect any contradiction to what we agree with them in holding as a fundamental principle of man's relation to God—namely, his responsibility—in the doctrine of the Scriptures respecting the work of the Holy Spirit, or in the exposition of that doctrine which is now before them. The responsibility of man is true, irrespectively of any doctrines of revelation; and in those doctrines it is constantly assumed. It appears to us to be *especially* assumed in the doctrine respecting the Holy Spirit's work in man's salvation: for we know of no position plainer than this, that the offences of man against the God to whom he must give account are so voluntary, and so habitual, that he never ceases to commit those offences till the Spirit of God renews him; but this plain position could not be true, if man were not responsible to God. To imagine that a man is no longer responsible to God, *because* the Spirit

of God has renewed him, is in like manner to imagine that the Spirit of God has transformed a man into a creature of a totally different, and manifestly inferior, genus: for it is below, not above, the level of man, that we find the ranges of beings that are not responsible to God. The Christian, surely, has a conscience. He is, certainly, as much the doer of his own deeds as any other man can be. Instead of being less, he is more, attentive to his sense of responsibility than he was before he became a Christian. He is addressed in Scripture as included in these universal declarations: "Every one of us shall give account of himself to God:" "for we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad."*

The whole current of the hortatory and monitory parts of the New Testament bears witness to the *permanent* responsibility of man, even when enjoying the consolation supplied by the assurances of grace, and sustained by the strong hope of everlasting life. And all Christian experience accords with the testimony of Scripture.—There is more than the absence of contradiction between the doctrine of the Spirit and the doctrine of responsibility, and between the fact of spiritual experience and the habit of looking forward to a day of account: they are harmonious truths, mutually corroborated,

* Rom. xiv. 12; 2 Cor. v. 10.

each illustrating the other. It is *because* God has bestowed on a man a gift so precious as His own Spirit, that the highest motives are added to the natural and the moral, for daily seeking to please Him; and it is *because* the sense of responsibility is quickened by the power of the Holy Spirit, and the strength to do the will of God comes from Him, that obedience is expected from a Christian, and is, in fact, rendered by him.—The responsibility of man, then, or his sense of that responsibility, is no more the creation of the renewing Spirit than is his memory or his eyesight: neither is that responsibility, or the sense of it, lessened by the Spirit. The laws of moral being, like those of the intellectual and the physical condition of that being, are inseparable from our nature: therefore, as it is in *man* that the Spirit works, and as the aim and issue of His work is the perfecting of humanity, it is impossible that personal responsibility should either begin or end with the renewing of the Holy Ghost.

(2.) Is the work which we ascribe to the Holy Spirit incompatible with the great principle of moral government, that the consequences of moral actions (whether reward or punishment) shall attach to the agent?

It will require peculiar calmness and thoughtfulness to perceive the manifold bearings of this question; and until its bearings—the most important, at least—are distinctly perceived, the answer, whatever it may be, is of little moment.

All persons who have reflected on their own moral nature, and have observed the course of providence, as witnessed by themselves, or recorded in the history of man, will have seen that the doctrine of the Scripture respecting man and the consequences of his voluntary actions, agree precisely with this nature, and with that providence. Such persons entertain no doubt that every man deserves the good or the evil which naturally flows from his spontaneous acting, and that this good and this evil, far from being confined to this world, are so exhibited here as to become the sure signs and tokens of the retributions of a future life. But do we not see that in the physical world there is an infinite variety of remedies, or reliefs, against some of the natural consequences of our folly and sin? Do we not also see that, in the social relations of man as we now behold him, “the sympathy and help of fellow-creatures afford men assistance which they would have had no occasion for had it not been for their misconduct; but which, in the disadvantageous condition they have reduced themselves to is absolutely necessary to their recovery and retrieving their affairs?” *

These analogies, furnished by the actual workings of divine providence in this world, entirely harmonize with the doctrines of Scripture which assure us that, in a way which fully maintains the sanctity of the divine government, the punishment

* Butler's Analogy, p. ii. c. v.

deserved by men for their sins may be avoided in the life to come. The principles, then, which are here recognized as common to the affairs of this life, and those of the life to come, are these: first of all, there is the principle of undeserved compassion; and secondly, there is the principle of *mediation*, “an interposition to prevent the destruction of human kind, whatever that destruction unprevented would have been; an interposition in such a manner as was necessary and effectual to prevent that execution of justice upon sinners which God had appointed should otherwise have been executed upon them; or in such a manner as to prevent that punishment from following, which, according to the general laws of Divine government, must have followed the sins of the world, had it not been for such interposition.” *

Christianity as a doctrine consists pre-eminently in the revelation of grace, and in the appointment of a mediator, through whom that grace is vouchsafed to man in such a way as to illustrate, instead of obscuring, the glory of the Divine government. One part of this mediatory plan is accomplished in the obedience and sacrifice of the Son of God: for by that obedience and sacrifice God displays his justice as well as His grace, in saving them that believe on the name of His only begotten Son. The other part of the plan is accomplished in the work of the Holy Spirit: for by Him the sinner

* Butler.

is led to believe, and then to prepare for the blessedness of the future by a life of holy obedience to the will of God. It is in the grace of God towards the sinner that we find the *reason* and the *origin* of the work which is performed by the Holy Spirit. It is for the sake of Christ the Mediator that the Spirit is given. When the Spirit is given, He produces in the sinner's mind a contrite acknowledgment of his offences, of God's right to punish him, of the justice which shines so awfully in the sufferings and death of Christ, and of the exceeding grace which, for Christ's sake, saves him. The repenting man is bound by authoritative law, as well as encouraged by revealed mercy, to rest his hope of salvation on the Mediator whom God has appointed for this purpose; and the results which flow from the grace of the regenerating Spirit, both in this world and in the world to come, are in most exact conformity with the aims and requirements of moral government. In the work of the Holy Spirit, therefore, we see the completest harmony with the administrations of the supreme law. Apart from this work, we should have beheld and experienced the awful, unquestionable, and irresistible power of right: *in* this work—connected as it is indissolubly with the mediation of the Son of God, we behold—and if we are believers, we experience, that right vindicated by grace.

The principle of grace, dimly shadowed in the ordinary course of providence, but clearly enun-

ciated in the inspired writings, is unfolded with great power and grandeur in the spiritual work of which we are here treating; so essential, indeed, is this characteristic of the work, that it is ordinarily expressed in the Scriptures by the simple term—GRACE. We are thus led, in pursuance of our present design, to show,

III. The harmony of the work which we here attribute to the Holy Spirit, *with the revealed doctrine respecting Divine grace.*

The Scriptures ascribe to God the absolute dominion of the universe: the whole scheme of created things being what it is, according to this supreme pleasure. Besides the express assertion of this supremacy in distinct passages,* it is implied in the numerous references made to the times, order, and variety of creation, and to those laws of nature, traced by physical science, which, in the higher and more comprehensive science of theology, are modes of the acts of God.† That department of the work of God which we speak of as His moral government, is, like every other department, a manifestation of His supreme good pleasure: it exists, because He pleases; and it is *what* He pleases. Because of the infinite and eternal perfection of His nature, His government is essentially right, immutably *good*. Now it is, as we have seen, a principle of this government,

* See Gen. xiv. 19, 22; Rev. iv. 11; Job xxxiii. 13; Dan. iv. 35; Rom. xi. 36; Eph. i. 2.

† See Appendix, Note H.

to hold man responsible, and to deal with him according to his doings. But we have also seen that these principles of responsibility and retribution are not acted on so rigidly and uniformly as to exclude all compassionate intervention for the relief of human misery. Such an intervention it is the special object of revelation to make known. In contemplating the mode of Divine acting revealed by the Gospel, our thoughts are raised *above the plane* of moral government: the same supreme right on which the moral government itself is founded, upholds another manifestation of the same good pleasure, in averting the evils which would have come upon man, if moral government had been the only or the highest display of infinite perfection. While the demands of moral government are fully met,—first, by the mediation of the Son of God; and secondly, by the results of the Spirit's agency; these arrangements of Divine wisdom are undoubtedly made in subserviency to a purpose which no principle of moral government could of itself have ensured: that purpose is, to unfold the plenitude of God's benignity towards those whom His law condemns, and whose misery His procedure as a Moral Governor secures, as the deserved and natural consequence of the sin for which they are condemned. This special aspect of Divine benignity is the *χάρις*, the GRACE of the New Testament. It is such a manifestation of Divine love as is not ordinarily given, either in the natural

course of providence, or in the administrations of moral government. It repeals no law, physical or moral. It abrogates no sanction of government. It recognizes no claim of right on the part of those on whose behalf it is displayed. It is that which God does, because it is congruous with His nature, and with His authority, with His wisdom, and with His love, to do it.

HE has to deal, in this case, only with those who are already righteously condemned for sin. For such persons the Holy Spirit is shed forth. In them He does the work which we have been describing. The remission of their sins, and the renovation of their spiritual nature, are alike acts of grace; and they are alike vouchsafed for the sake of the mediation of Jesus Christ. Unless we could absurdly suppose that the work of the Holy Spirit is superfluous, we must allow that none of the results of His work would have appeared, if He had not done what He has done. What He has done, is, in the simplest sense of terms, at once necessary and gratuitous: necessary, in order to the accomplishment of an end, which could not be secured without it; gratuitous, because those in whom He accomplishes the end, had no claim of right to its being done in *them*. There is, therefore, no semblance of contrariety between the work which we ascribe to the Holy Spirit, and the doctrines of the Scripture respecting the grace of God. If none of the condemned had been saved, we should

have been ignorant of that which we now conceive to be the highest attribute of the Highest Being: if all the creatures of God had been saved equally and alike,—either from sinning, or, having sinned, from its consequences,—there might have been no trace, in the boundless Future, of a moral government of God over men. We cannot conceive of any act of God as being otherwise than right, wise, good, and in all respects worthy of His adorable perfection; and, for this reason, we cannot associate with His grace any ideas but those of rectitude, wisdom, and goodness. We cannot think of His manifestation of Himself as gracious in any way that could warrant the application of terms involving notions that belong to mere dominion, or to the arbitrary show of power. All such terms, and all the associations which occasion them, belong to the imperfection of man, and can have no just or safe use when we are speaking of God. We are far from forgetting, indeed, that the compassion of God towards us is represented as being moved towards the entire human race, including even those who, through their neglect or contempt of the Divine compassion, are miserably lost. The whole Gospel, when it testifies, proclaims, exhorts, invites, is addressed to the *whole family* of man. The love of God in giving His only begotten Son, is *love to the world*. The propitiation is “for the sins of the *whole world*.” Yet the blessings of salvation which are thus freely presented to all men, are actually

obtained only by those who humbly, penitently, and gratefully receive them, according to the terms of the Gospel, as the gifts of God for the sake of Jesus Christ. There is nothing in the Gospel, there *can* be nothing in God, to prevent any man to whom the Gospel comes from thus accepting its blessings. Still men are *free* to reject them: they are not forced on any.

Now, let the number of those who receive the blessings of salvation be regarded as ever so small, or ever so large, our attention is called to this great truth of Scripture, that each man's acceptance of them is distinctly ascribed to the "*grace of God.*" The grace of God is, therefore, represented as doing something for man, without which he *would* not have accepted the blessings of salvation; and from this it is inferred that the difference between a man's spiritual condition before he accepted the blessings of the Gospel, and his state of mind when he does accept them, is owing to that *something* which grace has done. That *something* is what we mean by the quickening, the renewing, the regenerating by the Holy Ghost. It is not merely an offer of doing, but actual working: not a tendency to be developed under certain conditions, but the Power which secures a result. The harmony of this view with all the truths of Scripture respecting the boundless compassion of God towards man lies here: the Spirit of God accomplishes, so far as they *are* accomplished, the designs of the Divine compassion. We have seen, in a former Lecture, that the grace

of the Holy Spirit which exhibits salvation to the understanding, and urges it by whatever is majestic, tender, and earnest in the invitations or remonstrances of love, on the free choice of men, is often exhibited in vain. We know, however, that this grace is not always exhibited in vain; and it is in the "renewing of the Holy Ghost" that we find the solution of the difference, wherever it is found, between those who are not saved, and those who are saved by the grace of God.

Here, we must repeat, is a clear line of distinction between that system of truths, motives, and appeals, by which the Spirit of God addresses men in the Gospel, and that inward work by which He actually renews the spirit of man. The external system is *one* fact; the inward operation is *another* fact. In the one case, the Spirit addresses all to whom the Gospel comes; in the other, He regenerates those by whom, in consequence of that regeneration, the Gospel is received. The external system is of such a nature, that so long as man is free to act according to his cherished dispositions, it can be, and it is, resisted; the inward operation is of such a nature, that it is not, cannot be, resisted; because it is Divine Power, and, therefore, superior to all resistance. The external system is included within the range of moral government: the inward working belongs to the higher department of saving grace. The external system maintains the glory of Divine righteousness and Divine mercy, and leaves the

unrepenting, unbelieving sinner under the heavy charge of *wrong*, embittered by ingratitude, and aggravated with insult; the inward working maintains the benignity of Divine energy, enabling and disposing the repentant and sanctified believer to ascribe all he is, all he enjoys, and all he hopes for, to the grace of God, to that grace entirely, and to that grace alone.

IV. It remains that we exhibit the harmony of these truths respecting the Holy Spirit *with other truths which are, confessedly, mysterious*. The strongest thinkers are those who soonest reach their limits. By grasping, with comparative ease, whatever comes within the domain of the human understanding, in our present state, they find their inquiries bounded, their powers exhausted, and their knowledge at an end. To them there is a mystery, an *unpenetrated secret*, in every path of contemplation. Their own consciousness is, with them, an *ultimate fact*; they know that so it is; but they can give no other explanation. Their mental perception of *things* which are not in their minds, are to them utterly inexplicable: yet, however ingeniously they may reason, as Bishop Berkley did, and as the profoundest reasoners in Europe have done more recently, in the line of philosophic speculation,—they have no doubt of the *fact*, that they mentally perceive the objects presented to their bodily organs of sensation. To them it is inconceivable *how* anything can begin to be: yet they are fully persuaded that it is inconsistent with what they know, to imagine that the

things they see are without a beginning; and their *reason* reposes on the sublime fact—that one Being is self-sufficient and eternal, and is—Himself uncaused—the Cause of all things else. To them a miracle is rendered *improbable* by all their convictions of Divine wisdom and immutableness, founded on an enlarged observation of the course of nature; yet the *evidence* that miracles *have been wrought*,—the impossibility of holding many unquestionable truths of fact, without also believing the honest witnesses of miracles,—the congruity of attested miracles with the mysterious inspiration involved in the very idea of a revelation,—and the manifest differences between the miracles recorded in the Scriptures and the pretended miracles which have been exploded by the tests of critical examination,—all these reasons satisfy them that what would otherwise be improbable, is, in fact, certain. The work of the Holy Spirit in renewing sinful man is like the other facts now referred to in this one respect—it also is mysterious. It may be contrary to irrefragable abstract reasonings from *assumed* premises; it may be unlike some other facts made known by ordinary observation and experience; yet it is, itself, a fact, revealed in Scripture, and so revealed as to harmonize with every other fact. We believe that it is even so, as the Scriptures teach. But if men ask—*How* does the Spirit of God renew the spirit of man? the only answer is—“the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.” “The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou

hearest the sound thereof; but thou canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit.”

We are not here affirming that the renewing work of the Spirit is miraculous: it wants the *external* and visible character of miracles. But we are affirming that the mysteriousness of this work, instead of being an objection, is a confirmation of its reality; mysteriousness is no reason for rejecting the doctrine of Scripture, any more than mysteriousness is a reason—which it cannot be—for rejecting the evidence of miracles, the doctrine of creation, or the fundamental and unproved beliefs on which all human knowledge rests. There *may be* some settled law of operation according to which whatever is now mysterious to us, proceeds: we can scarcely conceive how it can be otherwise: and it is possible that, in the ever-growing intelligence of a future world, the whole scheme of God in his ways towards men may be gradually unfolded, to enkindle our love, and to deepen our adoration of the Perfect One; and in the light which eternity will cast on the mysteries of time, it may be that we shall fully know not only what the mystery *is*, but why it was so long a mystery, and how its being a mystery so long was one of the manifold displays of that wise and holy love to which all our happiness will be joyfully ascribed. Meanwhile, let us seek repose from all our perplexities, in “that most delicious repast, and richest cordial of our soul, the nearest resemblance, the sweetest foretaste of

paradise by which we are united and incorporated into Christ himself, being made living members of his body, partaking a common life and sense with him; compacted into the same spiritual edifice, dedicated to the worship and inhabitation of God, our bodies and souls made temples of His divinity, thrones of His majesty, orbs of His celestial light, paradises of His blissful presence.”*

FOURTHLY :—WE SHALL NOW OFFER SOME FACTS, ILLUSTRATIVE OF THESE TRUTHS, FROM THE HISTORY OF MAN IN GENERAL, AND OF THE CHURCH IN PARTICULAR.

I. The most serious and meditative men whose views are recorded for our instruction in the writings of ancient times, have so expressed themselves as to impress us with the belief that they sometimes perceived the need of some such work as that which we ascribe to the Holy Spirit.† Among the Greeks and Romans there was a universal belief of the *direct influence of the Deity on man*. Among the most thoughtful of the Greeks we may select Socrates, and his eminent disciples, Xenophon and Plato. As for Socrates, he not only held this general notion, but, as is well known, he ascribed what was right and good in his own conduct to the guidance of an unseen power.‡ Xenophon attributes to Cyrus a sentiment, which,

* Barrow's Whit-Sunday Sermon, on the Gift of the Holy Ghost.

† See Appendix, Note I.

‡ See Life of Socrates, by Wiggers, for a compendious view of opinions respecting the Dæmon of Socrates.

whether really entertained by the Persian king, or expressing only the views of the writer, or those of his master in philosophy, is equally applicable to our present purpose—for he ascribes it, with much fervour, to the favour of the gods, that he had been *sensible* of their care, and that in his successes he had never thought himself more than a man.* Plato represents Socrates as insisting to Alcibiades on the supreme importance of knowing the state of the soul. He shows that happiness consists in virtue, and that vice is slavery: then, having led his disciple to confess that vice ought to be avoided, as being suited only to slaves, he touches him to the quick with this piercing appeal: “Well, then, my dear Alcibiades, do you not perceive in what condition you are? Are you in this noble disposition of mind, so suitable to a man of your birth?—or,” “Ah! Socrates, I well perceive I am in the condition you speak of.” “But know you not how to deliver yourself out of this condition, which I dare not name, when I speak to a man of your standing?” “Yes, I do.” “Well, how can you deliver yourself?” “I can deliver myself, if Socrates please.” “You do not say well, Alcibiades.” “What then should I say?” “You should say, If God pleases.”†

In the second Alcibiades, which is a dialogue on prayer, Socrates tells Alcibiades, “It is alto-

* Xen. Cyr. L. viii. c. vii. s. i.

† Plato's Dialogues. Alcibiades I.

gether necessary you should wait for some person to teach you how you ought to behave yourself, both toward God and man." "And when will that time be, Socrates, and who is he that shall instruct me? with what pleasure should I look upon him!" "He will do it, who takes a true care of you. But methinks, as we read in Homer, that Minerva dissipated the mist that covered Diomedes's eyes, and hindered him from distinguishing God from man, so it is necessary we should, in the first place, scatter the darkness that covers your soul, and afterwards give you those remedies that are necessary to put you in a condition of discerning good and evil: for, at present, you know not how to make a difference between them."*

It would seem to be in allusion to this sentiment ascribed to Socrates, that Plato himself says:† "But whosoever, elated with confidence, and inflamed in his soul at once with youth, ignorance, and pride, thinks he needs neither ruler nor guide, but is fit to guide others, is left destitute by God: thus abandoned, he goes on stumbling, and seems, to many, to be somebody; yet, in no long time, he is overtaken by a punishment unquestionable in its justice, and brings complete ruin on himself, his family, and his country." In the Sixth Book, *De Republica*, he says, "If any man escape the temptations of life, and behave himself as becomes a

* Plato. Alcib. II.

† De Legibus, lib. iv. (Ed. Steph.)

worthy member of society, he has reason to own that it is God who saves him.”*

Of the Roman writers it is almost superfluous to quote the familiar words of Cicero, “No man was ever great without a Divine afflatus.” In the epistles of Seneca to Lucilius we meet with some striking passages which are the more remarkable from the darkness and uncertainty with which they are connected. “This I say, Lucilius, a holy spirit dwelleth within us, of our good and evil works the observer and the guardian. As we treat him, so he treateth us : and no man is good except God be with him. Can any rise above external fortunes, unless by his aid ? He it is from whom every good man receiveth both honourable and upright purposes.”† The philosophical Emperor Marcus Antoninus, reviewing his past life, and the favourable circumstances of his education, says, “So far as it depended on the gods, on the suggestions, helps, and inspirations proceeding thence, I might already have attained to a life agreeable to nature, if I had not been myself to blame, in neglecting to follow the admonitions and the almost express injunctions of the gods.”‡

These sentiments are not adduced for the purpose of showing that the philosophers of Greece and Rome were acquainted with that work which the Scriptures ascribe to the Holy Spirit ; or that

* Lib. vi. p. 677.

† Sen. Ep. 42.

‡ M. Ant. De Suis. Lib. i. 6, 17. See Appendix, Note I.

they were the subjects of such a work ; still less, that their opinions, whatever they were, from whatever source derived, are of any authority in determining ours ; but because they seem to betray a sense, more or less profound and accurate, of their fearful want of something different from their reasoning faculties, and beyond their moral powers, to raise them to the perfection of human nature.

II. The course of Christian literature from the beginning opens to us a rich vein of theological reading, in the express or indirect acknowledgment of the truths we have been discussing. It is this that brightens the fragments of the earlier ecclesiastical writers. We cannot read their epistles, their homilies, their expositions of Scripture, their records of facts, without perceiving that the work of the Holy Spirit in renewing the moral nature of man was a matter of belief, and devout contemplation, in the churches of the first ages. We might fill volumes with well-known quotations to this effect. We need only refer, in general terms, to the most pious writers of the middle age, and also to the works of the Continental and the British Reformers ; to the writings of the Puritans and Nonconformists of England and Scotland ; to some of the most distinguished ornaments of both the established churches in this island ; and to not a few of the most cherished names in other churches both of this country, of America, and of the territories won by modern missions to the king-

dom of our Lord. It is not unimportant to observe that while differing on many particulars of greater or less importance, there is in all ages, countries, and churches, a manifest agreement respecting this vital principle of the Christian faith and character. Nor is it less worthy of remembrance, that this agreement is found, not only in formal statements of doctrine, but in practical exhortations—in narratives of fact—in liturgies and hymns for public worship—and in those numberless incidental occasions on which the inward sentiment breaks through the expressions of a writer.

We refer to these writings, let it be marked, not as authorities for religious belief, but as testimonies to this important fact—that the doctrine which we believe to be taught in the Scriptures is incorporated with nearly all that is distinctive, with whatever has been sublime, holy, mighty, and consoling, in the living history of Christianity.*

III. Pretenders to peculiar sanctity have, for the most part, sheltered their impostures, or hallucinations, under the assumption of a Divine spiritual agency, causing them to differ from other men. For this very reason, superficial and hasty persons have not been wanting to reject the whole notion of Divine agency on the human spirit as illusory and enthusiastic. But, would such pretensions have been made, still more, would they have been accepted by others, if it had been known

* See Appendix, Note K.

that real Christian sanctity had been produced without the Spirit of God; or if there had been no solid proofs of unquestionable Divine agency in cases previously known?

IV. We hold it to be true, that attachment to whatever truths are essential to the doctrinal integrity of Christianity, and to the practical control of this religion over the depravity and wretchedness of man, has uniformly kept pace with the decided maintenance, and the devotional acknowledgment, of the grace of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of man. We see how it must be so, in consistency of theory, on the admission that this is the true doctrine of Scripture: for the facts of the case we must be satisfied, at present, with citing, as our witnesses, the most earnestly religious men that have lived in past times, or are living now. There ought to be a wide difference *somewhere*, between a religion excogitated by man, and a religion revealed by God. That difference, be it what it may, is the essential characteristic of Christianity, worthy of the preparations which were made for it—of the inspiration which conveyed it—of the miracles which sealed it—of the martyrdoms which have enshrined it—of the conquests it has already gained—of the commanding position in which it now stands—of the enterprises it has prompted and sustained—and of the triumph which every man that watches it must see it is steadily proceeding to celebrate, in the coming events that cast their shadows before them on all

the systems and all the institutions of our world. Our deliberate belief is, that the essential characteristic of Christianity is—GRACE, *through a Mediator, renewing man by the Holy Ghost*. So we read The Book. And it is among men who so read it, that we see Christianity standing out as a distinct power, a living reality, subduing, yet exalting; piercing, yet comforting; humbling man as nothing before God, yet making him mighty against all evil, first within his own bosom, and then in the wide world around him.

LECTURE IV.

CHURCH NOTIONS RELATING TO THE HOLY SPIRIT.

“IT IS THE SPIRIT THAT QUICKENETH : THE WORDS THAT I SPEAK UNTO YOU (THEY) ARE SPIRIT, AND (THEY) ARE LIFE.”—John vi. 63.

WE can make no progress in the study of such questions as belong to the subject now before us without a clear and constantly recognized distinction between the teaching of Scripture respecting spiritual facts, and the human modes of representing them embodied in religious doctrines. Some of these human modes fall short of the revealed fact : others of them go beyond it, into the regions of speculation. The mode in which one man conceives of the work of the Spirit may be derived so entirely from sources neither spiritual nor scriptural, that our reverent belief of Scripture, or our personal consciousness, or both, may require us to reject it as positive error ; while the mode in which another man regards the same work may so manifestly accord with personal consciousness, and so naturally agree with the plain scope of Scripture on the whole subject, that his way of thinking will commend itself to us as substantially sound, sufficiently

correct in theory, and unquestionably safe in practice. There must be a tone of mind peculiarly germane to inquiries of this kind ; and if you reflect that we are now dealing with the work of God's grace in saving man, you will see that men are not in sympathy with the subject, nor with the teacher, unless they are alive to the dangers which lie, not around us, but within us, dangers the less likely to be avoided, or even suspected, because of their being so deeply enfolded in our most spontaneous feelings. It is necessary here—yet not enough,—that we bow before the majesty of Supreme Wisdom with a humble recollection of our darkness and feebleness : besides this, we are to recollect that our moral state is fearfully disordered ; that the pride of man is such that it will give to error the aspect of truth, and pervert truth to the purposes of error ; and that, for these reasons, we approach the true only in proportion as our moral estimate of ourselves is one which lays us silent in the dust. But then this humbleness of heart must not be superstitious. It must be the effect, not of terror, but of conviction. It is not the abasement of any one man in the presence of any other man ; but of both, and of both alike, before God. We have to be on our guard against the pride of other hearts as well as against the pride of our own. We are to be careful lest any creature should stand for us in the place of God. Those who have so read the New Testament as to fill their minds with what is there revealed concerning man, need not be taught

that it is in human nature for one man to make any assumption which another man's inaptitude, or fear, may allow; nor need they be told with what ingenuity, how plausibly, in what various forms of sanctity, and with how many proofs even of sincerity and good intention, their fellow-men will thrust themselves in between God and their souls, pleading the authority of His awful Name for excluding His Spirit from His own work. Those who have added to the devout reading of the New Testament an intelligent study of Christian history, will remember the insidious process by which the human in religion has stealthily encroached on the Divine. According to the teaching of Christ and the apostles, every man is warranted by the Gospel to believe; every believer is himself a priest, offering his own spiritual sacrifice, and receiving for himself spiritual blessings; the whole company of believers on earth constitutes in itself a church, a clergy, a priesthood; the spiritual life which each receives from Christ by the Spirit dwelling in him, is the common privilege, the uniting principle, of all; and it is by the supernatural gifts of the Spirit, or by the natural qualities quickened and consecrated by His Power, that the members of the church, severally, aid in the outward manifestations of that Power by which the church was created and is sustained. But this Divine spiritual life has had to work its way among men whose hearts were not freed from the tendencies of human nature, whose habits of thought and action in religious matters

had been moulded by their national ideas, their old religious systems, their philosophies, their social condition, their political experience, and the training of the separate positions from which they had been called. These tendencies account for much of what we find in the actual progress of the Christian institutions.

After the apostles, the earliest teachers of the Gospel were simple and earnest believers of the great facts, the fundamental doctrines, of the apostolic testimony. These were succeeded by rhetoricians, advocates, scholars, philosophers, who were prompted by their intellectual tastes, and by their previous associations, to adorn and to explain what had hitherto been received as true, because it was taught by the accredited ambassadors of Christ. After them arose a long line of men, fitted for the guidance of the afflicted church, through struggles with persecution from without, and conflicts of opposing opinions and interests from within. Now, in these transitions, the minds of the Christian people were led by insensible degrees to lose, in the mere adjuncts of religion, much of the individuality, the spiritual life, the inward fellowship, enjoyed by the church at the beginning. The church assumed the visible organization of human institutions. The doctrines of the Gospel received the tincture of men's opinions. The teachers of Christianity became a class; and the unity of the church was imagined to consist chiefly, if not wholly, in the ministry

and subordination of her rulers. The sacred *caste* which, though an element in all other forms of religion, is foreign to the genius, and opposed to the positive ordinances of Christianity, thus became—and has continued to this day—the most prominent feature in that outward form which Europe has revered as Christianity. The sacerdotal caste absorbed the functions which, at the beginning, were common to the entire church, or to such members of the church as had manifestly received spiritual fitness for spiritual work. The whole mode of thinking suggested by particular terms which had been used in the New Testament was laid aside; and a mode of thinking suggested by the use which later writers made of the same terms, and of others added to them, came up in its place. Thus “the free and free-making spirit of the Gospel”* having ceased to operate as at first, the church system became rather a hindrance than a developement of the spiritual religion of the Son of God. In consequence of so wide a departure from the *inworking* Christianity taught by the apostles, we find less and less importance attached to that personal spirituality which so pervaded the first churches as to constitute their character; while, on the contrary, we find more and more of that deference to human judgment, and that dependence on human mediation, which reached their climax in the ecclesiastical despotism

* Neander.

of the mediæval church. Most happily, the spiritual life of men was still preserved,—it always had been, as it ever must be,—by the “Spirit of grace” himself: and not a few movements of this life may be traced, with various degrees of power, at different times, and in sundry places. To one such movement history has given the name of the Reformation: for though the capital controversy of the reformers with their opponents turned on the vital question of justification by faith without works, that question itself was carried by the spiritual consciousness of *men*, before it was determined by the arguments of theologians. The Reformation achieved for man his spiritual freedom only partially; nevertheless, it did assert, with a power which even Christians perhaps have not yet fully appreciated, that intellectual freedom which only awaits a strong manifestation of the spiritual life to destroy for ever every kind of thralldom to which man has submitted.

How far we are, at this day, from such a consummation, may be soberly thought of by those who look at the present aspect of Christian affairs. Not the least humiliating of the reflections forced upon the most anxious observers is, that nearly all men agree in looking *without*, for the impediments to the spiritual life. All the impediments however, *are within*. They are in the church as a visible, catholic body. They are in particular churches; in every church. They are *in man*,—wrought in the frame-work of his ideas of what

the church is, of what the church does, and of the way in which the church works. All this comes from confounding the teaching of the Scriptures respecting facts, with the human modes of conceiving of those facts which are embodied in church systems. We shall be well employed in the present Lecture, if we can present this confusion in a form in which it may be handled. This we cannot do unless we proceed in the spirit of disciples—the disciples, not of the church, but of the Spirit. We have seen in the New Testament, what the Holy Spirit teaches respecting man. *We are now to see, in church documents of sundry kinds, what man has been teaching respecting the Spirit.*

Admitting that the spiritual life is not of man, but of God, and that it is begun and maintained by the Holy Spirit, the general ecclesiastical theory in relation to this great truth is this,—that what the SPIRIT OF GOD does in this matter, is done *by or through* the ordinances of the church *administered* in that way which the church has determined to be properly authorized. As this theory is presented in the Roman catholic church, it is abjured by Protestants. As it appears in other churches, it is abjured, to some extent, by all persons not belonging to these churches. Our present object is not, from our Protestant standing, to assail the form in which the church of Rome requires men to hold her doctrine of spiritual grace; nor, as men identified with a church holding its own form of doctrine on this subject, to

assail the form of doctrine held by any other church. Special reasons may arise for making such assaults. It is perhaps not possible to go through the present discussion without saying much that will, at least, have the appearance of doing so. Certainly we do not aim at this, but rather, at a dispassionate examination of a theory which, so far as we know, is applicable to the constitution of every church in Christendom. Every church has doctrines, ordinances, formularies of worship, a ministry, an order, all of which it regards as duly authorized. Churches may differ from each other in the views they take of what is duly authorized; while each church proceeds on the belief that its own order is the right one. Leaving every man to judge which of these churches of Christendom is right, in the points wherein they differ,—let us confine our attention to that which, in any church, is settled as being, in the judgment of its members, precisely what it ought to be.

FIRST.—It is very extensively believed,—THAT THE SPIRIT OF GOD IMPARTS THE GRACE OF REGENERATION THROUGH THE MINISTRATION OF THE CHURCH.

The ministrations of the church thus honoured are, by some, confined to the case of sacraments, particularly baptism; others include, along with baptism, the preaching of the word; and, by others again, the sacraments are omitted, and the preaching of the word and ministerial prayer are regarded as the means of spiritual re-

generation. In each case, you perceive, still, the ministration of the church is regarded, in some respect, as the medium through which the Spirit regenerates.

The complete development of this doctrine must be traced in the ecclesiastical writers of successive ages: for it is a vulgar error which supposes it to be peculiar to the church of Rome: indications of it abound in some of the earliest remains of antiquity. The tendency which was remarked in our first Lecture, to prefer the material to the spiritual, and the human to the Divine, has been at work in all times: so that we find the most spiritual teachers of the church using expressions relating to the outward ministrations of religion which shew that, in their imaginations, these were often confounded with the inward and spiritual. It probably was their deliberate conviction, that the work of man in administering outward forms was entirely distinct from the work of God, in imparting spiritual grace; yet it is manifest that they regarded the one as, in some sort, indissolubly united with the other; and they applied to the doings of the church an apparently intrinsic efficacy which, though derived from the real or supposed presence of the Spirit, was made so prominent and exclusive, as to draw men's thoughts from the invisible agency of the Spirit to the visible ministry of the church. If such men as Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Cyprian, could think of church-ser-

vices in such a way as their language leads us to infer, it is easy to see how such thoughts, so expressed, would be received by their converts and disciples, bringing with them, as those converts did, to the church of Christ the sensuousness of their ancient religious ideas. The luxuriance of oriental fancy, and the warmth of African passions, were rather fostered than checked by the speculations of the prevalent philosophies, and by the deep significance which the Roman genius gave to official forms. Nothing was easier than to associate the awfulness of Grecian mysteries, or the terrible solemnity of the military *sacramentum*, with the outward observances of the new religion. In the progress of time the suggestions of imagination acquired the preciseness of definition, taking their place in the grave discussions of Basil the Great, of both the Gregories, and of Augustine, among the essential truths of the Christian creed. The subtle and thoroughly drilled intellect of the Scholastics was suitably employed in inventing such refinements as might reconcile these crude notions of tradition with the spiritual nature of Christianity. At length it was determined by the authority of councils, that the guilt of original sin is remitted by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ bestowed in baptism; that this sacrament *contains* and *imparts*, as well as signifies, the grace; so that all who are not *regenerated by the grace of baptism* are born to eternal misery and everlasting destruction.*

* Con. Trid. Romæ, 1564.

The reformers perceived,—not very decidedly at first—the evil tendency to externalism, which had thus assumed such portentous prominence. Most of them retained the notion that by these outward ministrations the Spirit was given: though they differed from the Roman hierarchy, in making their efficacy depend on the faith of the recipient, instead of the office and intention of the priest, and in taking less stringent views of the dependence of the spiritual gift on human ministration. At the same time, they were far from attaining to what we conceive to have been, even as they themselves afterwards conceived, the simplicity and spirituality of the pure doctrine of the New Testament.

True it is that, from the earliest times, through the entire series of ecclesiastical writings, many passages might be selected for the purpose of proving that the Spirit of God was not thought to be confined to the ordinances of the church. Men were taught that they *might* be members of the outward church without being partakers of saving grace; and it was conceded that the reception of converts into the church *might* take place long after their spiritual conversion to God, and that there *might* be examples of conversion, instances of salvation, beyond the sphere of the church. Nevertheless, there was a constant tendency towards magnifying the church, investing her ministers with official sanctity, and extolling her outward services, *as on the whole* indispensable

to man's salvation. This tendency is inherent in human nature; but it is not easy to detect it unless it operates on a large scale, and is developed through a long course of time.

The history of the church during several centuries, and under every conceivable variety of circumstances, is the register of human ignorance, weakness, and ambition, controlled, indeed, by Divine grace, yet not destroyed: and we must forget all we know to be true of human nature, thus exemplified, before we can allow reverence for cherished names and holy men to hinder our pronouncing an independent judgment on what they did and said. Nothing lies more open to the well-informed in such matters, than the inveterate habit, among the early Christians, of applying to the *outward* church which was organized by man, the descriptions and the promises that belonged to that *inward* government which was carried on by the Spirit of God; and, in later times, when there was less of that vital power which did so much to neutralize the bad effects of such a habit, we are not surprised at finding its strength increased. When, through a long period, the associations of men's minds had become fashioned by custom, and determined by authority, we may easily judge how inevitable it was that the Christian people should think as they were taught to think; that much of their religious belief should be implicit, and that any impeachment of the sacredness of the church, any freedom in criticising the productions or the acts of the teachers, should be generally resented

as an impiety, not far from blasphemy. It was not in this particular direction that the reformers of the sixteenth century laboured for a return to the normal Christianity of the apostolic age. They did protest against the *abuses* of church power; against the corruption of morals in high places; against the superstitions which deluded and debased the people; against the perversions of fundamental Christian doctrine; but they were not, themselves, fully awakened from that dream of a visible institution as the dwelling-place of God on earth, which had so long beguiled the fancy of a slumbering church, and which the prejudices, the passions, the imaginations, and the interests, of so many had combined to represent as essential to the very being of Christianity. For this reason it was that, to the best men in an age adorned with the highest specimens of redeemed humanity,—there seemed nothing incongruous with the Christian religion in determining doctrinal truths by royal authority, or enforcing spiritual discipline by civil terrors. After whatever form they deemed it right to model their ecclesiastical institutions, they never abandoned the idea, that a large measure of power, (*potestas*, *δογματική*—*potestas*, *διατακτική*,—and *potestas*, *διακριτική*,) resides in the church, as an external institution; and that the exercise of this power is vested in the rulers of the church. Nor was this idea abandoned by the puritans of England; nor even by the non-conformist clergy. It is always spoken of as spiritual power; and everything within the entire sphere in

which this power is exercised, is regarded as sacred to things *spiritual*.

We see the activity of this principle—this notion of spiritual power belonging to an outward institution—in several of the facts which stand in relief on the surface of church history.

I. *There is ascribed to the visible church a federal relation to God which involves the possession of exclusive spiritual blessings.* The student of Scripture is familiar with the language on which this notion has been founded. The special modes in which God dealt with Abraham; with the Hebrews as a distinct people, having a peculiar polity; and with David, as the father of a royal house; are represented under the *image* of a covenant, or solemn mutual agreement, resembling in one or two respects, such a covenant as one man makes with another. In accordance with the *imagery* which the language of the Old Testament had thus made familiar to the Jews, the relation of Christ to his redeemed people is also spoken of as the new covenant—the better covenant—the everlasting covenant,—because the blessings of salvation through His sacrifice, were ensured to believers by the promises of God. Because the sign of circumcision is spoken of cursorily by the apostle Paul,* as “a seal of the righteousness of the faith which Abraham had before his circumcision,” certain outward observances of the

* Rom. iv.

Christian church are, in like manner, regarded as *seals* of the new covenant. Without now staying to question, or to affirm, the analogy by which this transfer of ideas from the old covenant to the new covenant is thought to be sustained, we must not forget that the grand characteristic of the new covenant is its *spirituality*. It is a covenant with believing men, bestowing on them spiritual blessings, through the mediation of Christ, and by the power of the Spirit. To them, the outward acts by which they express their faith, are of such a nature as to remind them with peculiar emphasis of the Divine promise; and they are also the occasions on which they receive from Him in whom they believe, a large supply of grace: for these reasons, it is natural for them to prize such special outward acts of worship, and to mark this estimation by singular terms, such as ordinances, sacraments, signs, seals of the covenant. But all this has been borrowed from descriptions appropriate to the spiritually regenerate, who are known to God, and applied to the outward organizations which are visible to man. All the partakers in certain outward signs are represented as being, on that ground, in a peculiar federal relation to God, from which those who are not partakers in such outward signs are excluded. Since all the circumcised descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were, as such, entitled to whatever privileges were included in the covenant of circumcision, all the persons regularly acknowledged as

members of the visible church are said to be entitled, as such, to whatever privileges are included in the covenant of grace. Instead of perceiving that the difference between the old covenant and the new covenant lies in the *outwardness* of the former, and the *inwardness* of the latter, the shadowy and obsolete relation proper to the old and evanescent state is thus improperly transferred to that which is new and substantial. In consequence of this illogical, unscriptural transfer, man's church is forthwith invested, imaginatively, with the dignities, powers, and felicities which Divine grace has bestowed on the spiritually redeemed: official rulers of the visible church are recognized as having a capacity, a function, and an authority, involving the gravest consequences, it is supposed, not in the present world only, but also in the future. Whatever may be the theory of church government, the order of clergy, the number of sacraments, or the formularies of worship, there is a prevailing belief that the members of the church, so constituted, and observing such institutions, are living in a relation to God in which they who are not members of the church are not living. From such a belief, it naturally follows, not that these outward things were designed to proceed, as *manifestations*, from a spiritual life which is prior to them, and independent of them, but that they become the vehicles *through* which the spiritual life is itself conveyed, or the ordinary conditions apart from which that spiritual life is not bestowed. The official

organs of the visible church thus become either substitutes for the Spirit, or agents of the Spirit, or fellow-workers with the Spirit. Men's minds, so hard to raise to the unseen and spiritual, soon settle down in the things brought home to their senses; and, in direct contradiction to the essence of Christianity, in entire opposition to the express principles and laws of the New Covenant, a body of men living on earth, imperfect, erring, sinful, and themselves, in too many acknowledged instances, *not having the Spirit*, are looked on as the administrators of that Covenant in which Jesus Christ is the only Mediator, and His Spirit is the only source of power. The error of such notions consists, not in denying the work of the Spirit, but in virtually superseding it,—not in regarding the blessings of salvation as given by covenant from God, but in translating the idea of the Divine covenant to the human institution and the outward forms;—not in *having* organizations, and officers, and formularies, but in regarding them as something else than that which, so far as they are scriptural, they were designed to be. Now a visible church is not spiritual, unless its members are renewed in the spirit of their minds. The acts of a visible church cannot be correctly spoken of, or thought of, as spiritual acts, unless they proceed from spiritual motives. The officers of a visible church are not, for that reason merely, spiritual persons. The relation of the members of such a church to each other, and to their rulers, is

not necessarily, nor always in fact, a spiritual relation.

It is one of the unhappy results of the confusion of thought on this subject, and of the consequent technicalities in language, which have been the growth of ages, and which prevail where they are least suspected, that what we are here saying will be regarded by not a few, whose understanding we respect, as little else than subtlety and excessive refinement. We cannot help it. We know the meaning and the value of our words. We have studied them, and weighed them. We are not speaking at random. We see clearly our grounds for thinking, and our reasons for saying, these things. It is our object to bring forward a plain fact, never hidden from as many as look below the surface,—*that images employed in Scripture to suggest spiritual truths have been mistaken for descriptions of outward facts*: and that such imaginary descriptions have been applied to things with which these spiritual truths have no connexion.

Where, but in such mistakes, not always innocently made, and seldom encouraged from purely religious motives,—do we find the mysterious and terrible power which, in one shape or other, has been wielded in the name of the Church, not over the prostrate multitude merely, but over the sceptred monarch, and the lettered philosopher; over conquerors and statesmen; over the lords and masters of mankind? Only believe that the church which men behold is *not* the temple of the Holy

Ghost; tear from your mind the veil which hides the spiritual covenant of God with regenerate believers, and for you the church has lost her terrors, her authority, her power. You are not dazzled by magnificent assumptions. You lay hold of the truth. In the light of that truth, the image which the nations have worshipped for a thousand years melts away like palaces of ice before the sunbeams. You see through the illusion. You are master of the secret. Carry that master secret with you through every form of the visible church; and whether at Rome, or Geneva, or Lambeth, or anywhere, you will acknowledge no covenant power in any outward badge; you will find the church only in the humble hearts wherein the Spirit dwells as the bond of union among all the sanctified in heaven and on earth.

II. *We mark the same outward tendency in attributing peculiar spiritualness to certain persons, and to particular usages.*

All persons are spiritual in whom the Spirit dwells. Every act of such persons, especially acts of Divine worship, being performed under the guidance of the Spirit, are spiritual acts. We may believe that, at all times, the most spiritual persons are found employed in those services which aim at the benefit of the church, and that in such employments they are guided by the Spirit. But, taking the most candid estimate that Christianity would suggest of the number of spiritual persons, and of the amount of spirituality to be found in

their religious ministrations, this is not the same thing as looking on them and on their services as spiritual, wholly, or even in part, *because* of the offices they hold, and *because* of the connexion of their official services with the outward administration of religion. To this latter mode of regarding such persons, and such performances, our attention is now pointed. Keeping in view the natural tendency of men to confound the outward manifestation with the inward being of spirituality, and to mistake, or substitute, the former for the latter, we learn how it came to pass that, when notions appropriate to the spiritual church were applied to the visible organization, the spiritual attributes of personal character and religious dispositions should be imagined to belong to certain offices filled by such persons, and to the actions usually performed by them, without any proof that the officers were spiritually qualified, or that the actions were accompanied by the spiritual dispositions which alone could give them worth or meaning. Nor is it difficult to understand how soon, how widely, and through what a long course of time, this substitution of outward accidents for inward realities was encouraged by the ambition of the few, and perpetuated by the superstition of the many. We are far from charging all religious teachers with that personal arrogance of which some have been guilty and others innocent ; we are merely tracing a process which has developed the natural tendencies of man in connexion with that religion which

is nothing, if it be not spiritual, and which cannot be spiritual unless it be animated by the Spirit of God in the hearts of evangelical believers. Let us not leave it to the contending sects, and to the rancour of polemical hostility, to detect an evil which is inherent in our corrupted nature. It is our wisdom to be on our guard against its working in our own minds and against its enthralling power when fostered by systems, sanctioned by authorities, and identified with human communities assuming, or receiving, the name of churches. It were strange, indeed, if that same human nature which is the root of all perversions in religion, should be conquered by the doctrines or the formularies of any institution which man administers. We should, rather, fear that the notion we are now considering entwines itself around the purest truths, embodies itself in the simplest as well as most complicated forms; rendering the maintenance of the Divine life a struggle against that which is within us at all times, and under every mode of professing Christianity. The more spiritual our religion is, the less will our attachment be to any of its mere outward accompaniments. While there may be much evidence of the presence of the Spirit with men whom taste inclines, or education pre-disposes, or habit reconciles, to imposing hierarchies and gorgeous rituals, such facts cannot be pleaded with those who admit them, as answering their objections to the *principle* and to the natural *tendency* of outward show in connexion with religion.

On the other hand, they who offer no sign of spiritual religion beyond the negative one of rejecting, disliking, or despising outward shew, may, all the while, be attaching an undue kind of importance to the humbler offices, and the plainer observances, of their chosen party. That which has been, may be. It does not become any of us to be so confident of our spirituality as to imagine that while we *see the mote in our brother's eye*, the Searcher of hearts discovers no *beam in our own eye*. The question of what manner of conducting religious services by spiritual believers is most accordant with the will of Christ, will not be difficult to determine, when Christians meekly consult the oracles of the new covenant, and consult them not *apart* as rivals, but *together* as brethren. Be the right manner of conducting religious services what any Christian conceives it to be, it must be that which is most in accordance with the spiritualness of Christian doctrines, and of the hidden life which those doctrines direct and nourish; and its worth must lie, not in that which is visible to the world, but in that which is apprehended by the church. So long as the church is weak in her conflict with the world, and with the flesh, much of what is ascribed to the church belongs really to the world; and not a few of the things which are conventionally spoken of as spiritual are those which an apostle would denounce as carnal. Would that the ministers of every church might be entreated, with the humility of love, to labour after

the highest attainments in spiritual discernment, purity and energy; and that the members of every church might, in the same temper, be reminded, that ministers, liturgies, and outward ordinances of every kind, whatever be their authority, are not in themselves sacred persons, and sacred things; that they are not necessarily, not exclusively, the accompaniments of grace; that they are not vehicles of spiritual power; that human phraseology respecting them may be conventional without being correct, ecclesiastical rather than scriptural, and savouring less of religion than of superstition.

With the views now expounded we cannot look without jealousy on a large portion of popular language and of prevalent usage among all classes of professing Christians. There is a danger, common to us all, of supposing ministers of religion to occupy a position between God and the people which is inconsistent with the universality of the Christian priesthood, and of looking on the services in which they are engaged as having some power besides that of vividly presenting truth, earnestly appealing to the man within the breast, and helping the devotion of their fellow-worshippers by cultivated intelligence, and cherished fervour. Men may lose the sense of dependence on the Spirit, and the enjoyment of his promised succours, by looking to the human official, when they ought to be supplicating the Divine Comforter. There is a good, at least an innocent, construction of such an expression as the “means of grace;” and we might seem to be too

much concerned for merely verbal accuracy if we were strongly to avow our objection to it; but we do fear that beneath this consecrated phraseology there often lurks a *mode of thinking* which is not Scriptural, and which is not safe. We know what that mode of thinking is among those who entertain lofty opinions of sacerdotal prerogatives, and of sacramental virtue: we trace it in creeds, in catechisms, in forms of worship, and in the current language of ecclesiastical writers; and in quarters where men renounce adherence to well-known systems, we often meet with proofs that, though with a change of form and circumstances, the error still lingers in their hearts. If by “means of grace” no more be meant than states of mind in which the Spirit gives us grace, and the connexion of such states of mind with the instructions of teachers, and with offices of devotion believingly attended to, we should be only fastidious in taking exceptions to such language; but if it be the old church notion of *media gratiæ*—the notion that *through* these means, as channels and instruments, the Holy Ghost works invisibly within men—against that notion, by whatever words conveyed, we must gravely and conscientiously protest. Neither the Scriptures, nor the Christian’s experience, permit us to doubt that prayer for what God has promised, offered with faith in his promise, is followed by the blessing prayed for; and the history of Christianity abounds with proofs of some established connexion between the preaching of the Gospel, and the sal-

vation of men's souls. But who that ponders the meaning of words can believe that either prayer or preaching is the means through which *the actual gift of salvation* is conveyed? It can be no disparagement of so vital an exercise as prayer, to conceive of it as being, what it really is, the address of the devout heart to God, but not the channel of God's grace to man.

Neither can it be any disparagement of the preaching of the Gospel to regard it as being, what it really is, the truth of God addressed to man,—but not the vehicle of the Spirit by which man is prepared to receive the message with the faith whereby we are saved. Let whatever we are required to do be done with assiduity and faithfulness, whether it be to pray, to preach, or to wait on God in any service of our spirits; and let all reverence be felt and shewn by those by whom such service is conducted; but let Christians take heed lest they lose their way in cloudy notions which, though they may not identify the work of man with the work of God, or make the greater dependent on the less, approach nearer to the *opus operatum* of the Romanists, than to the simple truth of the apostles. Prayer has its proper place. Preaching has its characteristic function. Symbolic ordinances have their appropriate use. In all these respects man has his appointed sphere. But the Spirit does his own work. He does it “as He listeth.” However stated or ordinary the connexion of His work with ours may be, we cannot be too

watchful against the “tradition from our fathers,” that would commingle agencies so essentially distinct.—We know how delicate a task it is to mark the boundary between the human and the divine, in many of the works wherein the one and the other are alike concerned. The bearing of this difficulty on the general subject now before us, and the principles which guide to a true solution, will afford enough scope for a separate Lecture. We are at present grappling with a positive though not very sharply defined opinion which, in its extreme expression, is condemned by all who repudiate the authority of the Tridentine Fathers; and which, even in its gentlest form, we ascribe, not to the teaching of the Scriptures, but to the written or unwritten creeds of churches.

III. We observe the same outward tendency in the *assumption of a certain right in the rulers of the church to dictate, to control, or to supersede, the spiritual actions of its members*. According to the theory of the Christian church revealed by divine wisdom in the New Testament, “the whole body, fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the inworking of each one part, maketh increase of the body to the building up of itself in love.”*

Whatever the work of bishops, pastors, and

* Eph. iv. 15. I have translated this passage literally. It is curious that in the quarto English Bible, printed by Eyre and Strahan, the king's printers, London, 1813, there is the word “*holy*” instead of “*whole*” at the beginning of this verse.

teachers, may be, that work cannot be incompatible with the free working of living spiritualism by which the church is increased and built up in love. There must, then, be some deep error at work, a fearful absence of spiritual vitality, where the members of the church are not using the gifts bestowed on them for the increase of the church. If the gifts freely bestowed on Christians to be freely used by them for this purpose, are superseded by supposed official power in the rulers of the church, there is an infringement of the liberty which Christ has given, not less opposed to the spirit of the gospel, and to the right of every believer to do his own duty, than that coercion from without against which the rulers of the church have ever been the first and loudest justly to declaim. We believe that in the visible congregation of Christians there must be order and distinctions of office; and we are willing to admit that the order of any given church is that which the Lord intended it should be; still it cannot be His intention that there should be no *spontaneous* signs of spiritual energy among the members to whom no office has been committed.

The same line of historical review which shews the tendency of mankind to confound the visible form with the inward belief of Christianity,—thus preparing the way for substituting the one for the other,—will also shew the process by which the vital activity of the whole church was regarded, first as *represented* by official transactions, then as *controlled* by them, and afterwards as *absorbed* in them: scattering

the seeds of the notion which we find still widely prevalent, that it is for the officials of the church only to labour for the increase of the church, because it is supposed that their ministrations are “an appointed channel,” “vehicles” for spiritual blessings. This notion relates to something beside the instructions, exhortations, and other functions more especially relating to order which, in every church, is committed to the charge of its appointed ministers: it relates to right, to prerogative, to a peculiar connexion with the Spirit’s work which is held to belong exclusively, by divine ordination, to the ministers of the gospel. By those who cling to this notion in its most uncompromising assumptions, no Christian, however qualified by gifts, by knowledge, by grace, or by opportunities, would be allowed to follow the judgment of his mind, the prompting of his conscience, the impulse of his most spiritual and devout affections, or to hope that the Spirit will give success to his undertakings. He might, it is true, seek admission into the sacred order; or he might act under the authoritative guidance of a spiritual superior; but any one person, even all the persons constituting the body of the church, would be frowned on, interfered with, rebuked, and excommunicated, for venturing to ascend from the level of the people, to the higher platform of the clergy. So far is this notion carried in some quarters, that unless Christians are commissioned by authorities presumed to be successors of the apostles in the government of the church, all their

efforts to increase the church by spreading the gospel are set down as unauthorized methods, on which the blessing of God cannot be expected, and to which no promise is given, either of perpetuity or of success.

Even when this theory of church government is abjured, the same notion, though in a mitigated form, is still found to work. The persons bearing rule in the church may be distinguished by other titles; their bearing may be more humble; and they may act more in the spirit of felt and acknowledged equality with their Christian brethren; yet there is in men's minds an opinion, either, that the Spirit of God sustains so much closer a relation to their services than to those of ordinary believers, that the increase of the church is to be looked for almost exclusively from their official labours; or, that no other labours can be considered as undertaken in a right spirit, or with a reasonable prospect of success, without their sanction, and their guidance. Wherever this means no more (as we know it does, in numerous cases) than a wise regard to the harmonious acting of the church, it comes not within the purpose of our observations. But in many cases, probably throughout the general body of professing Christians, the notion is seen to prevail, that spiritual work belongs to those who, being placed in ecclesiastical offices, are therefore looked up to as spiritual men. Besides the power for doing good which ministers possess in their knowledge of the

gospel, their faith as believers, their love to their fellow-men, their devotion to their Saviour, their Christian deportment, their earnestness in prayer, and their ability and diligence in teaching, it seems to be thought that they are endowed with an *additional* power, not possessed by their equals, or even their superiors, in all other respects, which rests upon them *as* the ministers of Christ, and of His church. How many “talents” of which an account will be demanded, this mode of thinking has “hidden in the earth,” the day of judgment will reveal. In the anticipation of that day we may be allowed to confess uneasy apprehensions. We would urge on our fellow-Christians the need there is for the sifting of their thoughts on this subject. They ought to have good and *examined* grounds for believing that they are right, before they yield to an opinion which seems so nearly to approach one of the most pernicious forms of anti-Christian error, and which produces on the church an effect which resembles lethargy, where all ought to be instinct with the activity of spiritual life. Were it not for the narcotic power of the notion on which we have been animadverting, the people of a country where a spiritual religion is professed would not be found exhibiting that reliance on the prayers of ministers *for* them, rather than *with* them, which is usually accompanied with a grievous unwillingness to receive instruction in that gospel which it is the business of ministers to preach. How is this deeply-seated popular delusion

to be banished from the national mind, if Christians themselves, not a few ministers even—are practically influenced by a notion which we deliberately believe to be fundamentally the same?

IV. Our theme embraces the *notions which have been held on the relation of the spiritual church to the civil polity of men, and the connexion of religion with the world.*

That body of believing worshippers which is animated and guided by the presence of the Holy Spirit, was, from the first, *called out* from the unbelieving world. It was separate from the world,—“not of the world.” It is one of the permanent functions of this living organization to bear testimony by teaching, by practice, and by suffering, against antiquated error, and against every kind of earthly-mindedness and sin, and to seek the pouring out of the Spirit to give effect to the labours of its members for bringing others to unite with them. The peculiar constitution of the church, and the special character of her ordinances, mark her out as set apart for this mission. The failure of professed Christians to accomplish this purpose is the consequence of that tendency of the visible to supplant the spiritual which we have been endeavouring to detect. By departing from the model and from the spirit of the apostolic age, men have wandered into the regions of fog and vapour, and have mistaken the torches of their own kindling for the pillar of fire from heaven.

(1.) At the head of church notions on this sub-

ject we may place—*Spiritual supremacy*. Because the regenerate are under a higher law than that of this world, and their spiritual affairs are infinitely superior to all others, no sooner was the whole range of ideas and of words appropriate to the regenerate transferred to outward institutions, than a right was claimed by the rulers of the visible church to superintend the temporal concerns of all its members. Hence came the arrogant demands on the part of the clergy which shook all Europe to its centre for many centuries of dark intrigue and desolating war. We see the same pretensions substantially incorporated in nearly every form of European government. We see, on the one hand, large immunities, splendid honours, lucrative civil appointments, and vast political powers, assigned to men who are revered as the spiritual rulers of the church; and, on the other hand, we see what are called *spiritual* functions assumed by princes, magistrates, nobles, and legislators. The privileges of citizenship are bounded by ecclesiastical arrangements, and forfeited by ecclesiastical offences. Men have lost sight of the antagonism between the church and the world. The governments of the world are founded on the pressing wants of man's earthly life. They relate to the *things of the world*, the defence of persons, property, and character. They are ruled by the common sense, the interests, the judgments, the experience, the prejudices, the ambitions of men, in relation to their worldly interests. They

have changed, sometimes for the better, sometimes for the worse. Their power is seen and felt in this world. They are "temporal." On the contrary, the church of Christ is founded on the truth and the grace which come from another world. It lives by the Spirit of God. It is ruled by principles and motives which are Divine. Its laws are fixed. Its hopes and fears reach into eternity. Its bond is love. It belongs to heaven more than to earth; and not to earth at all, but as a school of discipline, a field of conflict, or as a foreign land, through which pilgrims travel to their home.

(2.) Next in order, we place *those notions which maintain the national incorporation, or legal establishment, of churches*. As it is the duty of every man who knows the gospel to be a Christian, so every nation ought to be religious. Religion should consecrate every act of life; and, therefore, legislators and rulers of every degree should discharge their official duties in a religious spirit. The safety and prosperity of commonwealths are maintained by establishing Christian truth and piety in the convictions and habits of every mind. This establishment cannot be ensured by practices which are not themselves Christian. We have gone through the elaborate pages in which Hooker* treats of the church and the nation as one body. We have examined the theory in which Warburton describes the state as sanctioning the church in

* Eccles. Pol. Book VIII.

return for the political benefits which religion bestows on the community. We have tested the analogies which are drawn from the civil government of the Hebrews to the civil government of Christians. We have duly weighed the utilitarian philosophy of Paley; and the commercial arguments relating to supply and demand, applied to Christianity by Chalmers. We have studied, with deep sorrow, the "Christian Politics" of Mr. Sewell. We have canvassed the reasons by which it is sought to prove that to promote religion is a necessary and sacred object of government, especially as administered by Christians. We have patiently investigated the claims advanced for the religious establishment which now exists in England, as the nation's surest defence from popery and from anarchy, from rebellion on one side, and from tyranny on the other. In *every one* of these explanations and defences of a plan for linking Christianity to the institutions of this world, we trace the workings of a spirit which, we are persuaded, is quite alien from that of the inspired apostles. It is not the spirit of the church raising the world, but the spirit of the world bringing down the church. It is a logical consequence of a primary error. It results from the practical confounding of spiritual with carnal things. It is an outward compression of elements that will not *freely* coalesce. It is a manufacture, not a growth. It is mechanism, mistaken for organization. It is the handiwork of man, standing

in the place of the creation of God. It is the product of ingenuity, not the fruit of faith. It is policy, not religion. It is of the flesh, not of the Spirit.

(3.) To the same class belongs every notion, whatever it may be, that goes to *secularize the institutions of the gospel*. The church of Christ is not a society, nor a confederation of societies, in which the "will of man" has force. Divine worship is not the display of human tastes; the preaching of the gospel is not an effect of genius. The triumphs of religion are not gained by worldly influence. Whatever latitude may be given to the consecration of rank, or wealth, or intellect, or imagination, or of anything that man can be, or that man can hold, to the service of God in this world, it should be kept in perpetual remembrance by Christians that nothing *outward* is religious, unless it be the manifestation of the inner life which is nourished by the Holy Spirit. We know how costly and how attractive the embodiment of men's ideas of religion have been. We dare not say that architecture, and music, and high eloquence, and solemn ceremonials, have always been—or that they have never been—the outworkings of a truly spiritual devotion. Nor dare we say that meagreness, and deformity, and meanness, and bad taste, are either proofs of superior spiritualism, or signs of stinted service, or of defective reverence. It were well for all men to watch the drift and tendency of modes of thinking on those subjects. That is a far reaching exhorta-

tion, that warns us “not to be conformed to this world, but transformed by the renewing of our MIND, that we may prove what is that good and acceptable will of God; presenting our bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is our reasonable *worship*.”*

We leave to the pastoral department of Christian teaching, and to the mutual admonitions of the Christian brotherhood, the stirring up of believers to their personal conflict with the spirit of the world. Our present object, perfectly consistent with that, is to characterize *opinions relating to Church matters*, which are apt to escape the vigilance of all but the most thoughtful, and which, in them, it requires peculiar delicacy as well as unshrinking faithfulness to point out. Let us look fairly at our situation. The spiritual worship of the church is beset with secular dangers on every hand. They come from the lower portions of society as well as from the higher; from the side of liberty as well as from the side of tyranny; from the restlessness of the many as well as from the ambition of the few. Ignorance and obscurity, weakness and inexperience, are not less worldly than the shining qualities which have won the admiration of ages. Vulgar rudeness is not more religious than polished amenity. The will of men acting in masses may be not less opposed to the authority of Christ, than the will of one man acting

* Rom. xii. 1, 2.

by himself. Mere numbers do not determine the true and the right. Religion can be popular without being spiritual. Many an evangelical institution enjoys the confidence of wise or able men who have no sympathy with its spiritual motives. Now it is of the very essence of Christianity to raise and dignify *man as man*, to place the poor and the feeble on an equal footing with the rich and the mighty, by disposing all alike to believe the gospel, and to live after the Spirit; and the highest honour a Christian can receive among men is, in lowliness and kindness, to serve his brethren with all the gifts which God has granted to him.

The strength with which the Spirit sustains the church is chiefly shown in the free play of every part, the healthful working of "every joint." The movement of the spiritual is, in this respect, foreshadowed by the natural. Each planet rolls in silence around its centre. The seasons follow the sun's apparent path along the zodiac. The tides obey the moon. Fires within, and the waters on the surface, have given to earth her mountains, her valleys, her plains, her springs and streams, her continents and islands, her minerals and soils. The seed sends up its tiny stem, and, by inward power assimilating the outward elements, works its unconscious purpose, till the flowers come forth to breathe the air of spring, and to drink the dews of heaven, leaving behind them, when they fade, the seeds of after years. The insect and the winged fowl sport in

the free air ; the fishes in their native waters ; while creeping things and four-footed beasts move, according to their several instincts, on the earth. Man comes forth free as other living creatures, but with a higher freedom of his own, endowed with power to observe, to understand, and to use, the things around him, as pledges and types of his unseen inheritance. But he cannot read the lessons which the heavens and the earth and all that they contain are teaching him, until he sees the methods and the laws of their development ; nor can he use them otherwise than in accordance with those methods, and in obedience to those laws. Man can move his brother man only by acting towards him on the principles of their common nature, on the thoughts, the passions, and the habits, whereby the curious web of our humanity is self-woven. Man can act only on that which *is* ; and he can act on that only in the observance of established laws. He cannot produce the spiritual life ; nor, when it is produced, can he either perpetuate or guide it. He may, indeed, set up a mimicry of spiritual functions ; and that which he sets up may last so long during ages when *names* are put for *things*, that he may come at last to imagine that human traditions are divine truths, that shadows are substances, that the things which can be seen are spiritual.

The Spirit of Christ is the life of the church. By studying “the law of the Spirit” as it is revealed in Scripture, and worked out in the spi-

ritual life, we may apprehend all that can be apprehended by us of the methods of His acting: and, otherwise than by obedience to *that law*, it is impossible to sustain and enlarge the church.

The sacred study to which we have now made reference might be called,—though we have no fondness for such terms,—the spiritual philosophy: while obedience to the law with which this high and rare philosophy is conversant might be called, the application of spiritual truths to the practical concerns of life. The one is theology: the other is—religion. A man may be a theologian without religion: he may be religious without theology, as thus explained; but he who would theorize wisely, or act with safety in relation to the church, must needs be—both.

SECONDLY: — TO ALL THESE TRADITIONAL NOTIONS IN RELATION TO THE SPIRIT, LET US NOW OPPOSE SOME PRINCIPLES DRAWN FROM SCRIPTURE, AND FROM CHRISTIAN CONSCIOUSNESS.

If we look at these notions, separately, and analyze them, we discover that they are pervaded by one fundamental error: not one of them is based on man's spiritual nature, nor on those portions of Scripture which expressly and fully set forth the truth respecting the Holy Spirit. So far, indeed, are they from being based on either the one or the other, that they will be seen, on comparison, to be contradictory to both. This will be made to appear from the facts and reasonings which follow.

I. *The church notions relating to the Spirit are*

founded on usage, and supported by tradition. The origin of the usage lies in the habits of thought which the early teachers of Christianity brought with them into the church, and then embodied with their doctrines. The New Testament supplies no foundation for assuming that the teachers of Christianity are a permanent corporation; a separate and graduated order; a priesthood; a clergy; a church; the select and consecrated vehicles of spiritual blessings; the medium of communication between the Holy Spirit and the Christian people. Under the guidance of apostles, and agreeably with their instructions, as many as were by the Holy Spirit qualified to teach, were employed as teachers, according to their several abilities. The church was the organized body of believers, as a whole. Every Christian was a priest offering his own spiritual sacrifices.

Instead of appealing to the most ancient documents, and the only authoritative standards of Christian truth, the advocates for church notions are evermore appealing to the Fathers. Those who are taught by the Spirit may well demur to that authority, and refuse to have such questions so determined. They may admit that the writers styled Fathers are competent witnesses of facts coming under their own observation. They can listen attentively to these believers of a former time while they tell *what* they did, and they may confidently rely on their testimony. But when these witnesses are appealed to in support of opinions, judgments, and inter-

pretations of the New Testament, we are under the necessity of examining whether they themselves put forth such a claim ; or whether they possessed the spiritual qualifications which alone could entitle them to occupy so conspicuous a place, involving so much dread responsibility. On the particular question now before us, their testimony, their opinions, and their practice, may be briefly stated.

(1.) Clement of Rome shows that, in his day, the appointment of the overseers of the church was made with the consent of the whole church.

“The apostles preached the gospel to us from our Lord Jesus Christ :—Jesus Christ, from God. Christ, therefore, was sent by God ; and the apostles by Christ ; so both were, in proper order, sent by the will of God. Having received their mandates, therefore, fully assured by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and thoroughly persuaded by the word of God, they went forth, *filled with confidence by the Holy Spirit*, and proclaimed that the kingdom of God drew nigh. As they preached the word through regions and cities, they appointed their first converts, whom they had proved by the Spirit, as the overseers and ministers of those who should believe.” “Our apostles knew, by our Lord Jesus Christ, that there would be strife for the name (or dignity) of the oversight (of the church). For this cause, therefore, having perfect foresight, they appointed the persons before mentioned ; and afterwards they gave directions

how, when these should die, other thoroughly approved men should succeed to their ministry. Those therefore who were appointed by apostles, or afterwards by other excellent persons—the *whole church consenting*—and who have blamelessly served the flock of Christ, with humbleness of mind, peacefully and disinterestedly, and for a long time well reported of by all men, such men we do not think can be righteously cast out of their ministry: for it will be no light sin in us if we cast out of their oversight (bishopric) those who have worthily and blamelessly fulfilled its duties. Happy those elders who, having finished their course, have obtained a peaceful and perfect dissolution; for they have no fear lest any remove them from their allotted place.”*

The whole epistle is a meek and brotherly entreaty to the Corinthians to subdue the passion and emulation which occasioned disturbances in the church, and threatened the removal of their ministers. It is, for the most part, such an epistle as might now be addressed to any church whose ministers were chosen by their brethren; and its tone and temper are widely different from such epistles as have since been addressed by authorized rulers to an insubordinate congregation.

(2.) Remarkable is the contrast of this epistle of Clement with those of Ignatius: in six out of seven epistles said to have been written to several

* Clem. ad Cor. c. xlii.—xliv. Ed. Cot. See Note L.

churches by Ignatius during his progress from Antioch to suffer martyrdom at Rome, the claims of the clergy to the submission of the churches are advanced with a boldness and even arrogance which more than warrant the suspicions cast by critics on the genuineness of the text.* The unity of the church is spoken of as consisting in such submission as he claims: the laity are called on not to think for themselves, but to follow the directions of the clergy. For claims like these he pleads, not the authority of the apostolic writings, but tradition, and the assumed analogy of the Jewish priesthood. Tertullian, and those who follow, press the demands of the clergy on similar grounds. In all of them, the authority advanced is not that of the *written* traditions of the evangelists and apostles in the canonical books, but of uninspired men, and of a supposed analogy which the inspired writers had not sanctioned.

(3.) Throughout the whole patristic compositions we detect the *hierarchical bias* which the apostles foresaw, and against which they forewarned the churches. The direct consequence of these sacerdotal assumptions was, to inflate the clergy with a species of self-importance, little compatible with the humility of Christians; and to prepare the laity for spiritual bondage; while, indirectly, it fomented the strifes and heresies which distracted and weakened the churches in the earliest times following those of the apostles.

* Appendix, Note M.

II. *To appeal to the traditions and usages of these Fathers in the present day is a much more comprehensive evil, fraught with deeper mischief to the spirituality of the church than is, perhaps, fully appreciated even by those who object most strongly to the practice.*—It withdraws the mind from the Spirit as a teacher, by putting the judgments and practices of fallible men in the place of His truth. As a consequence of this transfer of reverent attention from the Divine to the human, that which is true is displaced by that which is false; and men are led away from the unseen and spiritual in religion, to its visible, material symbols. The venerable authority which—in other, but totally different, respects—belongs, of right, to ancient names, the length of time through which the error has continued, and the number, station, piety, genius, or literary acquirements, of the persons who have been misled by it, cannot turn what was originally false into the truth. It continues to be false, by whomsoever it is believed. The attempt to revive such a falsehood may call into exercise great ingenuity and much learning: it may wear the semblance of humility or of piety; it may be made with sincere and upright intentions; or it may serve as a disguise for interested and party purposes; but no labour can destroy its original defect—*the want of truth*. They who, by the Spirit of God, are taught “the truth which was from the beginning,” are expressly guarded against such illusions; they are required to bring them to the

test; and, having proved that they are not the lessons of the Holy Spirit, they are to reject them.

III. *The social effect of such notions is now what it ever was.* They inflame the ambition of men. They create a distinction which is panted for by those who “have not the Spirit.” They bring the high sanctities of religion down to the arena of worldly strife. While one set of notions checks the evils that would arise from another set,—ecclesiastical supremacy, for example, checking political establishments, or political establishments controlling ecclesiastical supremacy, or opinions which embody the strong will of national independence resisting both,—the notions themselves, all of them, are hindrances to the free activity of spiritual religion. They perpetuate mistakes. They stereotype false doctrines. They encourage the usurpation by men of an authority which belongs to Christ alone. They ascribe to human associations a power which resides exclusively in the Holy Spirit. They deprive redeemed men of rights secured for them by their Saviour; and they discourage, or deter, them from the discharge of duties which they owe to their Supreme Lord. Under the belief, or the pretext, of sanctifying the powers of the world, whether those powers are called temporal or spiritual, whether they are monarchical or democratic powers, religion is reduced to a form, a shadow, or a name; and men’s natural aversion to the religion that is spiritual is so apparently confirmed by arrangements which they have been habituated to revere

as sacred and authoritative, that there is less hope of their becoming Christians than there would have been if they had not learned to speak of themselves as accepted worshippers of God already.—We are not so thoughtless as to forget, nor so uncandid as to conceal the fact, that the notions which we denounce as erroneous and mischievous, are often held side by side with pure and spiritual doctrines of the Gospel. But the belief of such pure and spiritual doctrines is not secured by the prevalence of any of these notions; on the contrary, the strength of the one is usually found in inverse proportion to the strength of the other. Even the believers and teachers of other doctrines of the Gospel who do not, also, believe and teach *the doctrines of the Gospel in relation to the church*, are apt to sympathize and co-operate with those holding the same church notions, though they differ from them in their views of the Gospel in other respects, rather than with those who, besides holding the same doctrines respecting personal salvation, have found in the Gospel, as they believe, the true doctrine of social fellowship, and of common service in the church. Thus the bond of union among men called Christians is error; a human notion instead of a divine principle; the spirit of the world in opposition to the Spirit of God.

IV. *The maintenance of these church notions has occasioned many controversies among Christians which have been dishonourable and hurtful to each of the contending parties.* There have always been acute

and conscientious minds to lay bare the contrariety of some one or other of these notions to the letter of the Gospel, and its incongruousness with the spirit of Christianity. But how could even the humblest or the meekest mode of pointing out such an error escape the charge of presumption—of meddling with settled truths—of disturbing the peace of the church—of insubordination to established authority—of overweening confidence in private judgment,—and, in not a few instances, of sedition against lawful government? Or, if the mode of pointing out the error has been arrogant, and angry, and contemptuous, who does not perceive theoretically, nay, who has not witnessed practically, the mischiefs engendered by the assault no less than by the defence? As long as it is held that spiritual functions belong of right to a separate class of men, and that these functions so discharged by them are the channels of the saving grace of God, and so long as these claims are upheld by powerful organizations, whether ecclesiastical or political, whether oligarchical or popular, so long the human spirit of adherence to institutions, and the equally human spirit of resistance to usurpations, must be brought into collision; the meditations of piety, the songs of praise, and the “unity of the Spirit,” will be disturbed and outraged by the war of party; and the fierceness of the conflict will be proportioned to the earnestness of the opponents. But suppose it were agreed on all hands that every one of these notions is alike

inconsistent with just apprehensions of the work of the Divine Spirit, we should behold, not indeed the conquest of one party by another, but of both by truth. It does not become Christians to forget that “hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, divisions, heresies, and envyings” are branded by an inspired apostle as “the works of the flesh which are manifest;” while the “fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, fidelity, meekness, self-restraint.”* Neither does it become a Christian to cling to the opinion that the particular church tradition which he has been taught, or has adopted, is certainly so much superior to some different tradition which his fellow-Christian has learned, that all the works of the flesh are on the other side, and the fruit of the Spirit entirely on his own. But we do not know of any Christian that would “grieve the Holy Spirit” by giving up the characteristic traditions of any church whatever, to join his brethren in “earnestly labouring (σπουδάζοντες) to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace.”† It is by each believer perceiving—not that another man’s ecclesiastical traditions are something added to the Gospel, but—that his own may include something which the Gospel does not teach, that we may hope to realize that which experience has shown to be, otherwise, impossible—an enlightened, free, hearty, and impressive manifestation of the oneness of the church. Is it vain to hope

* Gal. vi. 19—23.

† Eph. iv. 3.

for this? Will believers of the Gospel never “quit themselves like men,” never be “children in malice, but men in understanding?” We have another judgment in this matter. We are disposed to believe that, in every church, there is an increasing number of persons whose spiritual wants and sympathies prompt them to rely on the teaching of the Comforter in all things relating to their social well-being, their privileges, their obligations, and their common interests as Christians; that by secret experiences, rather than by visible associations, it will probably be given to them to harmonize judgment with charity, freedom with union, comprehensive principles with conscientious convictions; and that their humility and love will thus work out the problem which both tyranny and controversy have presented to the world as hopeless—each Christian thinking for himself, and all thinking alike—“perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment.”*

Of one thing we are sure; the hindrances to such a consummation do not lie in the intellectual or moral idiosyncracies of individuals, nor in the obscureness or vagueness of apostolic teaching, but in the effects of erroneous training, stimulated by the zeal of party, and added to the doctrines of the Gospel by the traditions of the several churches. Since the Spirit of God has produced the kind and measure of agreement already felt by Christian

* 1 Cor. i. 10.

people, and certainly increased by that unfettered intercourse to which providence affords so many openings, who that is wise, who that has hope for man, or faith in God, will say that such a consummation, so “devoutly to be wished,” is never to be witnessed among the substantial facts of this world’s history? We would not be so “slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken.” We would rather say in the language, if not precisely with the same reference, of the ancient seer,*—“Is the Spirit of Jehovah straitened?”

V. *The notions of the churches on the subject now before us have retarded the spread of the Gospel.* Before the last of the apostles died, the Gospel had been preached through the whole Roman empire, and even beyond its limits. The language of our Lord, the narratives in the Acts of the Apostles, and many allusions in the epistles, convince us that the unlimited diffusion of the truth was uniformly regarded as the concern of the whole church, and that the Spirit was with all those who laboured for this object. From the imperfect records embodied in the early church historians, we gather that, during the first three centuries after the apostolic era, the same spirit prevailed among Christians: churches were planted in the chief centre-points of Roman civilization, and along the confines of barbarian territories. When the decrepit empire was broken up by the fierce

* See Note N.

warriors from the north and from the east, the throb of spiritual life was felt amid the ruins. From Iona, and the neighbouring isles, went forth Columban, and Willibrord, and Boniface, and other earnest men, to sow the seeds of truth and righteousness in the hearts of the fathers of the modern European nations.

In every part of Christendom the necessities of government, the spread of commerce, and the progress of colonization, aided the efforts of the church in the extension of her institutions. That the means employed for this end were not always such as became a spiritual, free, and merciful religion, is too well known. We fear that the enlargement of the church as a visible and active seat of power over mankind, has been, for many centuries, a stronger motive than loyalty to Christ, or love to souls. We hold the opinion that an incalculable amount of evil was spread over the face of Europe, in Asia, and in the young American settlements, by the direct agency of the Nominal Church. We believe, as the result of some research and meditation, that the superstitions of the new settlers along the Danube, and the Rhine, and the Elbe, were but more deeply rooted by having engrafted on them the names and forms of Christianity; that the civilization of Europe, amid which the institutions of the church are so conspicuous, belongs more to this world than to the world to come; and, highly though we prize that civilization, as men, for what it is, and, as

Christians, for containing the germs of good hereafter to be ripened, we are not willing to accept it as the pure fruit of Christianity, to regard it as religion, to ascribe it to spiritual causes, or to refer to it with gratulation as the triumph of the Gospel, and the fulfilment of the prophecy announced by the seventh angel's trumpet, when "there were great voices in heaven saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ."*

By perpetuating the opinions of mankind which are independent of Christianity, and by accommodating to those opinions the framework of ecclesiastical doctrines and observances, much has been spread which is not the Gospel, but which, being mistaken for the Gospel, darkens instead of enlightening, and ruins men under the pretence of saving them. The realms of kings, and the heritage of nobles, have indeed been secured, enriched, and adorned by modern civilization: a goodly appearance of sanctity is given to society by the temples, orders, and ceremonies, by the lordly dignities, and the rich lands, which attest the obedience of whole nations to the church. But the freedom which has been conquered from the ascendant church in England, in Scotland, in Germany, and in France, in Switzerland, and in America, is a more precious element of civilization than royal prerogatives, or baronial immunities.

* Rev. xi. 15.

The safety of the cottage, and the peaceful industry of the plough, the anvil, the mine, of the loom and the ship, the wharf and the workshop, are grander things, we judge, than the glitter of courts, or "the pride, pomp, and circumstance of glorious war." It is the mark and gauge of modern civilization to reverse the mode of thinking on such subjects. Now there is a mode of thinking on other and higher subjects, which, however slowly, is undergoing a not less sure, but infinitely more beneficial, change; and as that change advances, we can chronicle the achievements of Messiah's kingdom, and gather "the fruit of the Spirit" into the eternal garner. The visible hierarchies, of every name, have their root in the earth; and they contain within themselves the principles of their own corruption. While they flourish, the gospel languishes. As the gospel flourishes, they fade, and pass away silently into the shadowy region of forgotten things. Civilization is promoted by the Gospel; and it has, again and again, been introduced by preachers among barbarous people too fierce, or too insignificant, for worldly conquest; while civilization, in its turn, prepares the nations for the Gospel, by the quietude, order, and freedom, in which men assert their personal right to believe what they perceive to be true, and to do what their consciences acknowledge as just. Our sympathies are with all truth, and with all right doing. We have so read the history of England, and of other modern nations, as to watch the progress of

intellectual and social freedom with an interest deeper than even that which rejoices the heart of every wise and good man in the more striking signs of national improvement, and political security: while, on the one hand, we have mourned over the apathy, the lifelessness, the cumbrous formality, the narrow views, and interested prejudices, upheld by the imperfect institutions which men in neighbouring latitudes, or in successive stages, have been reverencing as the church of their respective fathers, we have lifted up our hearts with gladness as, on the other hand, we saw the traditions of a thousand years overtaken and scattered by older truths, even as the mists of a long night are overtaken and scattered by the returning brightness of the morning. Holding fast the principles,—*the active beliefs*,—with which the apostles and evangelists went from Jerusalem and Antioch to claim the homage of the nations in the name of their ascended Lord, we hail the abandonment of every substitute for these beliefs, and of every addition to them: for we are well persuaded that until these human notions are abandoned by the mass of Christians, the church of Christ will never show her power to emancipate the world.—It is no slight proof of the vitality and energy which the Spirit has maintained in “the church of the living God,” that, notwithstanding all the clouds and phantasies of human error, and all the hindrances of human weakness, her testimony, her sufferings, and her labours have never wholly ceased. Where

the ancient truths of the Gospel are so believed that they are dearer to the heart than wealth, and honour, and home, and life, there the Spirit of God is : in that conquest of his own heart, the Christian has a pledge of the conquest of the world by the same power.

We go back, then, to the distinction with which we started at the beginning of this Lecture, *between the teaching of Scripture respecting spiritual facts and the human modes of presenting them embodied in religious doctrines*. The notions we have been analysing, and against which we have been reasoning, are not drawn from the Scriptures, but added to them. They are the noxious but unsuspected growth of ages. They spring from human fashions in thinking. They owe their authority to local and temporary combinations. They appeal to prejudices, not to reason ; they are supported by interest more than by conviction ; and they nourish superstition instead of strengthening faith. They have given to what men call the church the extension and the power appropriate to worldly institutions ; but with the fearful sacrifice of the divine truth, and the living energy, without which the church is nothing but a name.

It would betray unpardonable ignorance or vanity in any man to hope that he could uproot the errors thus produced and fostered in the world, by even the most luminous arguments addressed to any of the questions in which they are respectively involved. We may, however, hope for something better. Innumerable reasons are ever at hand, to

press on Christians the important truth—that no doctrine is religious, if it be not taught by the Holy Spirit; and that this teaching is to be sought in the writings of the New Covenant. The “words” of Jesus and of his apostles “are life:”—“it is the Spirit that quickeneth.” Amid the conflicting opinions of churches, drawn from their separate usages, and propped up by their one-sided traditions, it is our blessed privilege to go up to the well-head. Not to appreciate this privilege is a sign of wretched apathy: to neglect it, is to sink into languor and thralldom: to abuse it, by perverting the holy oracle to our party meanings, and conventional applications, is the most dangerous of all trifling with sacred things. Let the Holy Spirit be recognized as the Teacher of the church; let the minds of men receive His instructions with the docility of learners, with the humble trust of disciples; let His lessons be followed out into every walk and every relation of the spiritual life; let the active will, all the practical powers of human nature, be yielded to His inspirations, and moulded by his guidance; then will men feel how infinite must be the difference between that which He appoints, and that which man invents. “Whoso looketh to the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he not being a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the word, this man shall be blessed in his deed.”* “His deed” is the deed of an enlightened mind, of a free

* James i. 25.

mind, of a mind regulated by supreme and unerring wisdom, and gladly acting according to the suggestions that come to it from heaven. Whatever the church as a whole, or any particular portions of the church, may have done, or failed to do, the Scriptures are the common inheritance of all, — a field without a fence, a garden of knowledge and of life at whose gates no flaming sword forbids an entrance. The free study of the Scriptures by devout minds seeking wisdom from the Spirit, is our only shield from the mistakes of erring mortals. Without despising any help which superior knowledge or deeper experience can afford us in the study of the Scriptures, and without a harsh judgment or an uncharitable feeling towards such as differ from us, we are to gather the heavenly manna *with our own hands*; and, as we find it, so we are to take it, that we may be “nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine.”*

The time is not far off, we trust, when a better age will see the church of Christ set free from every “yoke of bondage.” In the days of trial which are coming on, men will have to show the authority of their church in the Bible, instead of receiving the Bible according to the authorized interpretation of their church. The errors of mankind have been the natural consequence of departure from the Scriptures; there is no remedy but in returning to the Scriptures. There is ONE “whose

* 1 Tim. iv. 6.

fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor.”*—“What is the chaff to the wheat, saith the Lord?”†

Let the “chaff” be winnowed from “the wheat;” then the world will see its worthlessness. When wearisome centuries of ignorance and strife shall have shown “what the boisterous and contradictory hand of a temporal, earthly, and corporeal spirituality can avail to the edifying of Christ’s holy church;”‡ the real spirituality of the church will be felt within; and it will be proved by outward demonstration. No longer walking in the mists where appearances are taken for realities, Christians will acknowledge that the “Free Spirit” of God does not confine His grace within human channels, but works according to His own will with all to whom He grants His gifts. Acting in the power of this acknowledged truth, they will trample out the last embers of many a fiery controversy; and, with one heart, and with one soul, they will spread the gospel from the rising to the setting sun. The union of the free, the dignity of the humble, the power of the weak,—“strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man,”§ will celebrate the victories of truth over error; of good over evil; and of the church over the world.

* Matt. iii. 12.

† Jer. xxiii. 28.

‡ Milton Of the Reformation in England.

§ Eph. iii. 16.

LECTURE V.

MYSTICISM.

“AND HEREBY WE KNOW THAT HE ABIDETH IN US, BY THE SPIRIT WHICH HE HATH GIVEN US.”—1 John iv. 24.

THE tendency of any extreme to generate its opposite, is one of the most familiar laws of our social nature. There must at all times have been persons who saw the illusion which made religion to consist mainly in outward forms, who struggled against the prevailing bias, and who used whatever liberty they had to make their dissatisfaction known. The men who reflected on the mysterious powers of their souls, were sure that religion was a mere pretence if it did not evidence its working there. Those who had access to the Scriptures, or to the writings of the devout in former periods, knew that the grace of which they read could neither be given, nor represented, by any ceremony. The experience of the truly regenerate taught them that, as in the natural life, so in the spiritual, the inward process must precede the outward indication, and that there must be vitality or there could be no action. According to the

various temperaments of individuals, the colour of their thoughts would tinge their language. Hence, in every stage of the social development of Christianity, there has been either a tranquil protest or a violent rebound against the domination of formalism. In these protests and rebounds, rather than in the continuous succession of events, we read the history of the church.

If the activity of the human intellect was forced to its highest exertions by the subtle speculations which opposed received doctrines on the inscrutable secrets of the Divine Being, it was not unlikely that a similar activity would be called forth by doctrines that related to the personal experience of mankind. On questions of this latter sort there could be no wide departure from the truth taught in Scripture without contradicting, to the same extent, the consciousness of Christian people ; so that other motives, added to the love of clearly defined doctrines, induced fervent believers to make a stand against this two-fold evil. But combinations for opposing error, or usurpation, have seldom been free from other elements of error, and other principles of usurpation, though in a contrary direction. Thus has it been with the conflicts of religion. The false doctrine has not been replaced by the exactly true, nor the vitiated institute of man by the simple ordinance of God. Progress has been made, but not in all respects. Though the gain, on the whole, has been on the side of the true, and the Divine, there has usually been

some loss of that which ought to have been retained ; while new thoughts have been admitted, or new habits acquired, which were not suspected until they had worked their appropriate mischief, to be destroyed by future reformatations. As the tendency towards outward manifestation, when perverted or excessive, produced formalism, so the tendency to fall back on the spiritual inwardness of Christianity, when disordered or exclusive, produced MYSTICISM.

If we were required to define mysticism, we should call it—the setting up of personal thoughts and feelings as the standard of truth, or as the rule of action. By mystical views of the spiritual life, we understand such views of that life as are adjusted by this standard, or ordered by this rule. The relation of such views to our present theme will be found in the fact, that men ascribe this inward standard of truth, and rule of action, to the direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit. The mystical views with which we are about to deal may be regarded under different aspects, as speculative—contemplative—imaginative—or practical. Speculative mysticism has found its place in the schools of philosophy and of morals. Contemplative mysticism has been the resource of the meditative, the tranquil, or the enthusiastic. Imaginative mysticism deludes the visionary. Practical mysticism misleads the fanatic. We shall now delineate these characteristics, without intending to represent them as the exact types of separate classes of persons.

I. SPECULATIVE MYSTICISM has found its place in the schools of intellectual and ethical philosophy. While some have thought to explain the intellectual attributes of man entirely or chiefly on physiological grounds, and others have renounced the physiological grounds to confine themselves to the unfolding of the mind's own ideas, under the notion that these ideas include all that it is possible for mind to apprehend; while one school has united the sensations occasioned by outward objects with the mind's reflections on those sensations, and another has striven to involve the sources of human knowledge in uncertainty and doubt; the mystics have risen up amid the disputants, and contended that the truth on all these questions is immediately revealed, without any speculative reasonings, to the inward man. So, likewise, with reference to the rule of action. The greater part of moralists affirm that the rule of human action is the will of God. That will is intimated, either in the eternal fitness of certain actions to produce given results—in the moral constitution of human nature—in the laws of the understanding—in the social sympathies, in the practical utility of acting according to truth and nature—or in the express precepts of the Divine revelation. To all these moralists the mystic says, the will of God is communicated IMMEDIATELY to all men, and our rule is written by His unseen finger, or whispered by His small, still voice, within us. This inward standard of

truth, this inward rule of action, is ascribed by the theological mystic to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. By some this inspiration of the Spirit is believed to be common to the human race; while by others it is believed to be restricted to particular persons.

The fundamental doctrine on which speculative mysticism rests, is older than the beginnings of philosophy. We find it in the earliest traditions of the East.

It would lead us away from our present purpose to touch the interesting inquiry, whether the first teachers of philosophy derived the rudiments of their speculations from the East. Notwithstanding the strong reasons which have been urged on the other side, we cannot follow the migrations from the countries east of Greece, or trace the radical unity of the earliest forms of philosophy with the oriental traditions, without acknowledging the oriental origin of *some* of the principles which received new forms and combinations from the peculiar tendencies of the Grecian mind; and we are the more persuaded of the soundness of this opinion, when we find the same principles pervading the philosophy of the Druids, and the mystical Initiations of Orpheus. Thales, the founder of the Ionian school, taught that *God is the mind of the world*. Plato taught that the soul partaking of mind, reasoning, and harmony, is not the mere work of God, but a part of God, not existing by Him, but of Him. In the spirit of

this philosophy we find Marcus Antoninus speaking of himself as a partaker of the divine mind, and saying, "Let him who would live with the gods, do whatever that divine genius (*dæmon*) which Jupiter has given him for a guide, as a particle of himself: this is the mind and reason of each man." Indeed this was the prevailing doctrine of the ancient philosophers.

When the Christian preachers began to spread the Gospel, this philosophical doctrine was held by some of their opponents as a reason for rejecting the Gospel, while by those of the philosophers who embraced the Gospel it was blended with the Christian doctrine.

Justin Martyr is not known to have sustained any office in the church. He was a *philosopher*, who had studied the writings of Plato and imbibed some of his principles. We trace such principles in his frequent reference to "the Spermatic Word," which he represents as having been given to men before the coming of "the Word Incarnate," and also in the expression that "the soul is incorruptible, being a portion and implantation of God."* Clemens of Alexandria appears to have thought that "by the continual contemplation of God, man enters into the Divine essence and becomes God (*θεοῦμενον*)."[†] Basil the Great held that every

* Ἡ μὲν ψυχὴ ἐστὶ ἀφθαρτος μέρος οὐσα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡμφυσήμα.
Frag. de Resur. ii.

† Stromata, lib. iv.

holy man is God.* Cyril of Alexandria, in his treatise against Anthropomorphites, maintains that the breath of life which God breathed into Adam was not the soul of man, nor of any creature, but the Holy Spirit, which is lost by sin, but recovered through Jesus Christ; and in his commentary on John's Gospel he represents "*the Word*" as "the grace given to every man, but rejected by those who, neglecting to go forward, being the illumination, and make their measure of grace, in some respects, to languish."

The same principle formed one element of the fantastic opinions of the Gnostics. In the controversies which distracted the Eastern Church, we detect, both on one side and on the other, the subtle working of the same tendency. It was embodied in the monastic institutions. The moral and devotional treatises of nearly every age, both in the East and in the West, betray, sometimes unconsciously, the same tendency. When the scholastic theology had given so scientific and logical a form to Christianity as to make it entirely an affair of the intellect, and while the popular superstition was at the same time degraded by the substitution of ceremonies for spiritual worship, there arose a large and interesting series of writers who with more or less pretensions to system, as they were more or less imbued with the scholastic

* Θεός ἐστὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἕκαστος τῶν ἀγίων. Adv. Ennon. lib. v. Opp. tom. ii. 140, Ed. Par.

habits of mind, turned away alike from the notions of the schools, and from the gross materialism of the vulgar, to find the saving truths of the gospel in the hidden operations of the soul.

In the mystic writers of the fourteenth century there is often a subtlety of speculation peculiar to the age in which they lived; and there is sometimes a vagueness of thought, a dreaminess of emotion, or a wildness of fancy, peculiar to the personal temperament or the secluded life of the particular writer, which can now be interesting only as illustrating the history of the human mind; yet in many of them we discover a fervour, a childlike simplicity, a spiritual freshness, which remind us of earlier times, and which no Christian can study even now without eminent advantage. Bernard is known only to the learned. Echart was condemned by a pope. Tauler is forgotten, excepting by a few. The memory of Suso has been revived in Germany. Ruysbröck's "Little Book on German Theology" was published by Luther, who highly prized it, and it has been praised by a modern German critic* as "a sound and energetic treatise, full of spirit and life." Hamerken of Kempen (Thomas a Kempis) is known to pious readers throughout Europe by his precious treatise on "The Imitation of Christ." Nearly at the same time with Thomas a Kempis, Marsiglio Ficino, of Florence, the translator of Plato, addressed an

* De Wette.

epistle to Lorenzo de Medici on the Christian Faith and Piety; and not long after, his fellow-citizen Savonarola published his *Triumph of the Cross*; and by his powerful preaching excited that strong spirit of devotion which spread the doctrine of justification by faith among the Florentine patriots at Venice, and, through them, over a great part of Italy. Valdesso, Valer, Egidius, and other eminent associates, laboured in various ways, amid overwhelming difficulties, to diffuse a similar spirit in Spain.

The revival of letters in Europe brought out the mysticism of the middle ages, in connexion with every department of knowledge, and more especially in connexion with religion. The empiricism of Hohenheim, who, in the Grecising fashion of the age, translated his German name into Paracelsus, heaped up a mass of incoherent fancies which his followers digested into a kind of spiritual theory — that true philosophy is learned from God alone by the inward light of the invisible man. This philosophy taught that life, intellect, will, action, and even vegetation, are produced by a luminous fire proceeding from the Holy Spirit who is the soul of the world. From this supposed Divine and essentially central light, our countryman Robert Fludd, professed to explain the mysteries of man, and of the universe. Following the same notion, Jacob Boelm, the philosophical shoemaker of Garlitz, turned away from the controversies of the Crypto-Calvinists of

Saxony, to solitary prayer and silent meditation, in which he believed that he enjoyed the intuition of God. His philosophy, which is a mixture of the scholastic notions of the age, and the opinions of Paracelsus, with the dreams of a strongly fertile and imaginative genius, he attributed entirely to the inspiration of "that Spirit which dwells in God, and pervades all nature."

To this theosophy John Baptist Helmont of Brussels was attracted by a dream which warned him to resign the studies in which his youth had been spent with extraordinary success, yet without attaining the certitude for which he longed. But of his dreams and extacies he brought forth an unintelligible jumble of contradictions, to which his son added new absurdities from the Cabbala of the Rabbins.

Antoinette Bourignon of Lille in Flanders, whose singular adventures are so full of romantic interest, had fed her thoughts from early childhood with such mystic writings as fell in her way; and observing how different the lives of Christians were from their professions, she sought for herself the intimate communings with God of which she had read, by fleeing from the society of men to the loneliness of the desert.* Encouraged by

* "Stop only at the things which move your heart to the love of God, without going further till you have found the means of practising it. This I did in my younger years; when I first saw the New Testament, and when I understood thereby what a Gospel life was, I closed the book for twenty years, and exercised

Fenelon, the pious Archbishop of Cambray, she passed some years of solitude in Flanders, from whence she returned to her patrimony at Lille; where, assuming the order and habit of St. Augustine, she presided over a hospital. There she was accused of sorcery; but she escaped to Ghent. She had not been long in that city, when she gave it out that God had disclosed many sacred mysteries to her. She published, at Amsterdam, a book entitled "The Light of the World." In that city she became a centre of attraction to imaginary prophets and prophetesses, and she began to hope that the reformation at which she aimed was about to be firmly established. Labadie and his mystic disciples sought to form a union with her at Noordstrandt; but she affirmed that their sentiments were not the same as hers, that they were ruled by their own spirit rather than by the tranquil inspirations by which she was Divinely guided. By means of a private printing press which she set up in Holstein, she diffused her writings, which were exceedingly numerous, and composed with incredible rapidity, over Germany, Flanders, and France. After being forced by persecution to lead a wandering life, she at length

myself in the practice of what is herein contained, and so I found the light of the Holy Spirit without using books to instruct me."—Letter IX. of the Treatise on Solid Virtue, in twenty-four letters to a young man who sought after the perfection of his soul. Dated from Holstein, near Goltorp Castle, May 5, 1672. St. Vet.

died at Franeker in Friesland, at the age of sixty-four.—Of a harsh and melancholy temper, violent in her self-will, highly imaginative, ardent, and endued with unbounded powers of language, she believed herself to be inspired from heaven to rekindle the extinguished fire of spiritual religion, by calling men away from the services of the church to immediate intercourse with God. Though she seems at her death not to have left a single follower in the country where she had lived, her writings were eagerly devoured.*

* Her “Light of the World” was translated and published by some of her Scottish followers, in English, with a long preface, claiming for her the character of an extraordinary prophetess. Her “admirable Treatise on Solid Virtue,” and her “Renovation of the Gospel Spirit,” are not unknown to the curious in these matters. “The Snake in the Grass” was published by Charles Lesley, the eccentric non-juror, who seems to have been the first English writer who combated the mysticism of Antoinette Bourignon.

She seems, at one time, to have had a great many followers in Scotland; and the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, in the year 1701, condemned her writings as “freighted with impious, pernicious, and damnable doctrines.” Dr. George Gardin, a minister of the church in Aberdeen, published an Apology for her opinions, which the Assembly also adjudged “to contain a mass of dangerous, impious, blasphemous, and damnable errors.” Dr. Gardin was deposed from his rank as a minister, and “prohibited from exercising the same in all time coming, under pain of the highest censures of the church.”—Acts of Assembly. 1701.

Previously, however, to this movement in the General Assembly a work had appeared, entitled “The Delusions and Errors of Antoina Bourignon, and her Growing Sect Detected. In Two Narratives. By John Cockburn, D.D. London: Printed for Wm. Kebblewhite, at the White Swan, in St. Paul’s Churchyard,

It is to the writings of Pierre Poiret that we owe the exact and logical exhibition of the mystical theology, in two works of remarkable acuteness and elegance—"Rational Thoughts concerning God; the Soul, and God:" and "The Divine Economy." In

&c. MDCXCVIII." Dr. Cockburn was, I believe, a Presbyterian minister, who on account of ill health had to leave his country, and take up his abode at Rotterdam. The first of the two narratives was written and published before he left England. Replies to it were issued before he had time to bring out the second. These replies were chiefly written by foreigners. In a letter to a friend in London, Dr. Cockburn apologises for the delay of his second narrative, and states that his object in the first had been to prove, that the judgment of M. Bourignon's advocates were not infallible, and far from being competent evidence in matters so important as those which she pretended to reveal.

The second narrative sets forth "The Pretences of Antonia Bourignon," and contains a well-written refutation of them. By extracts from her own writings Dr. Cockburn shows that she arrogated to herself a degree of sanctity surpassing all others; a knowledge of all things natural and Divine, greater than that possessed even by prophets and apostles; an acquaintance with things the most secret, and with matters of fact at the greatest distance, attained without reading, study, or any human means. Dr. C. shows that she pretended sometimes to inspiration guiding her in both the matter of her communications and the language in which she conveyed them; and sometimes only in their substance and matter; that she asserted a kind of union with God; that she was sent with new and full light to convert the world; to renew and perfect the churches as the last grace which men were to expect; that Christ was a type of herself; that she was the mother of all who shall be converted; and that she travailed as in birth when any were converted by her means.

Dr. Cockburn, after refuting these pretensions, shows that "it is usual with imposters and deluded persons to ape ridiculously what they read in Scripture," but that "such pretences

this latter work, his object is to reduce the opinions of the mystics into a system, and to explain them according to the principles which they involved. As the foundation of the whole, he maintains that there is in man a certain *inward and saving light* which consists in sensible, rather than ideal, knowledge. He thus separates the human faculties:—the faculty of passively receiving the Divine light,—boundless desire,—and boundless acquiescence. He represents the *passiveness* of the intellect as the only entrance to true wisdom and illumination; and the *activity* of the intellect he repudiates as forming nothing but ideal knowledge, and as injurious to the solid acquisition of truth. Starting from these principles, he teaches that if a man will turn from all creatures to the *truth shining in the centre of his mind*, he will be led to God, and to salvation, and become a true Christian, though he be ignorant of the letter of the Gospel; and that this light shining in men's hearts is the Spirit of Jesus Christ himself, by whose efficacy Christ is born within him. According to his triple division of the human faculties, he distinguishes these three kinds, degrees, or aspects, of saving faith;—the faith of desire, which is the fountain of conversion,—the faith of light, which is the cause of purification,—and the faith of

are too high to be rashly admitted;” and that “Antonia Bourignon had no credentials to justify her claims.”

From the end of his second narrative it appears that the author had designed a third; but whether it ever was published I have not been able to learn.

acquiescence, by which justification is secured. He represents regeneration as arising from the simultaneous operations of these three faiths.*

Poiret was endowed with a singularly perspicacious intellect; and he had been thoroughly disciplined in literature, theology, and the Cartesian philosophy. He sought to supply the deficiencies of his metaphysical speculations; and, convinced by the writings of Tauler, Thomas a Kempis, and others belonging to the same class, of the necessity of acquiring mental purity, he produced his first work, which sought to harmonize, on Cartesian principles, the jarring opinions of contending sects. But the study of the writings of Antoinette Bourignon shook his confidence in his principles; he exchanged the philosophy of Descartes for the doctrines of the mystics, and abandoned himself to the indulgence of his reveries, and the publication of his writings, at Rheinburg.

The modern mysticism of Germany is chiefly remarkable for its excessive *irreligiousness*, and its close alliance with a congeries of metaphysical clouds, misnamed philosophy, which by essaying to pass beyond the limits of the human faculties, turns day dreams into logical systems, and resolves all truth and all religion into the discovery that there is no God, or that God is but a name for the universe. The infidelity which in England took the form of natural religion, and in France that of

* Œcon. Div. tom. i., lib. iii., c. vii., sect. 12. Tom. ii., lib. v., c. ix.

ribaldry and ridicule, assumed in Germany the garb of speculation, and of sentimental feeling.

“The Society for Light and Illumination” held their secret meetings of philosophers and preachers at Berlin, and in their writings they substituted *living reasonably*, for the Scripture doctrine of the work of the Spirit; *the purpose of leading a new life* for regeneration; and *reformation* for sanctification.*

To the speculations of Kant, of Fichte, and of Schelling, as well as to the claims of Divine revelation, Friederich Henry Jacobi, in his work on “Divine Things,” opposed that intuitive and immediate knowledge of Divine things which he denominated Faith, Mental Feeling, or Reason, and which has acquired for his philosophy the name of Mysticism. It is a revival of the reveries of Boehm, of the Gnostics, and of the Orientals. Passing through such modifications as it could receive from the learned piety of Schleiermacher, the critical acumen of De Wette, the poetry of Novalis, and the picturesque genius of Carlyle, we now find it exciting to something like vitality the negative theology of Unitarianism, in America and in England.

Instead of receiving the authentic revelations of the Gospel, men are taught to look within themselves for the inspiration of God; to regard “wisdom,

* The works in which these deistical notions appeared, bore characteristic titles, such as, “The Worth of the Feelings in Religion;”—“The Religion of the Children of Light;”—“Christ and Reason;”—“Religion within the limits of Pure Reason.”

righteousness, and love, as the Spirit of God in the soul of man—the income of God to the soul in the form of truth, through the reason; of right through the conscience; of love and faith through the affections, and religious sentiments.” To become thus “partakers of the Divine nature, as the Platonists, Christians, and Mystics call it,” we are assured that “the soul of all flows into the man; that which is private, personal, peculiar, ebbs off before that mighty influx from on high.”*

We could not complete even this slight outline without some notice of the opinions of Coleridge, who is said to have “talked like an angel,” and whose influence, for good or evil, on the theology of our countrymen, it is of no slight importance to appreciate, especially from their relation to the systems which are slowly working their way among us from “the region of German theology.”

The mental attributes of Coleridge were of a high order, strangely blended, and luxuriantly cultivated. To a subtlety which would have acquired distinction in the scholastic age, he added a compass and breadth of thought which seemed as though it could grasp at once the rudiments of all truth. His poetical imagination seemed to aid his intellect by giving body, form, and colouring, to the most profound abstractions. His principal prose writings indicate the congeniality of his mental

* Parker's Discourse of Matters Pertaining to Religion, Bk. ii., c. viii., pp. 160—174.

temperament with the German philosophy, and not less congeniality with the theology of those writers who, in every age, have risen above the formalism of logic to the contemplations of spiritual piety. Laden with the stores of the principal literatures of Europe in all ages, he was in the habit of looking at the modern theology of England with aversion and with fear; and he devoted the ripest years of his life to the training of educated youth, especially the younger English clergy, to a profound view of the capacities of human nature, and, by the application of metaphysical principles, to present the orthodox theology as the expression of the highest reason, and as the fitting aliment of a truly spiritual life. His admiration of the most devotional compositions of Hooker, of Jeremy Taylor, of Dr. Donne, of Baxter, and especially of Archbishop Leighton, is expressed in terms which prove that he was not merely a literary reader, but a religious student, of those immortal productions. In his endeavour to harmonize the dictates of pure reason with the most sacred mysteries of Christianity, he familiarizes himself, and his readers, with forms of expression which convey no meaning to those who have not reached the same standing-place; and, even by them, they will often be found to correspond with their feelings rather than with their ideas of truth, or their conceptions of things, and thus to conduct them beyond the limits of speculation and reasoning to the domains of mysticism. Following

the Father of the so-called Critical Philosophy in his distinction between the understanding—or judging according to sense and nature,—and the reason—or the faculty of perceiving the spiritual, the infinite, the eternal, he condemns the restriction of moral and theological truths within the boundaries of the understanding, and claims them as belonging to the higher department of Faith, which he represents as the blending of the reason with the will, deriving from the reason its illumination, and from the will its energy. He never professes to discover any new doctrine; neither does he lower the doctrines of the Gospel after the manner of the rationalists, to adjust them to the preconceptions of the human mind. He affirms that there is a power in men, as such, to behold *by direct intuition* the spiritual beings, and the spiritual states, which the Gospel has revealed; but this power he says is not mere speculative reason; it is practical faith: and this faith is quickened and guided by the Spirit of God. Though Coleridge often speaks of “my system,” he is the least systematic of writers. Instead of either assuming or vindicating a set of established premises, and building on them a regular scheme of doctrine, he aims at turning men’s minds to the contemplation of the permanent laws of intellectual, moral, and religious truth which are within them; and it is by those only who have become habituated to self-reflection that his meaning will be understood, and the soundness, or unsoundness, of his particular views

appreciated. His distinguishing and noble principle is that "Christianity is not a theory, or a speculation, but a life, and a living process."*

In accordance with this principle, he affirms that "the Gospel is not a system of theology, nor a *syntagma* of theoretical propositions and conclusions for the enlargement of speculative knowledge, ethical or metaphysical. But it is a history, a series of facts and events selected or announced. These do, indeed, involve, or rather they at the same time *are* most important doctrinal truths; but still facts and declarations of facts."†

In the admirable commentary of Leighton on the first epistle of Peter, it is remarked that "faith elevates the soul, not merely above sense and sensible things, but above reason itself. As reason corrects the errors that sense might occasion, so *supernatural* faith corrects the errors of natural reason judging according to sense. Paul and all that are enlightened by the same Spirit, know by faith, which is Divine reason, that the excellency of Jesus Christ far surpasses the worth of the whole earth, and all things earthly Firmly to believe that there is *Divine* truth in all these things, and to have a persuasion of it stronger than of the very things we see with our eyes, such an assent as this is the peculiar work of the Spirit of God, and is certainly saving faith.

* Aids to Reflection, p. 146. 4th Ed. 1839.

† Ibid. pp. 118, 149.

Faith is the proper seeing faculty of the soul, in relation to Christ; that inward light must be infused from above to make Christ visible to us; without it, though He is beautiful, yet we are blind, and therefore cannot love him for that beauty.”*

In professed harmony with these expositions by Leighton, Coleridge maintains “that the Christian Faith is the perfection of human intelligence;”† and in pursuance of this object he labours to “substantiate and set forth the momentous distinction between reason and understanding.” His “Prudential Aphorisms,” and his “Moral and Religious Aphorisms,” are only introductory to his higher object in the “Aphorisms on that which is indeed Spiritual Religion.” By “Reason,” Coleridge means, with Hooker, “a direct aspect of truth, an inward beholding, having a similar relation to the intelligible or spiritual, as sense has to the natural or phenomenal.” His application of this to the spiritual life will be seen by comparing his

* It could not have escaped so sagacious a mind as Coleridge’s, that Leighton’s explanation of “reason judging according to sense” is word for word the definition given by the Founder of the Critical Philosophy of the Understanding, namely, “the faculty of judging according to sense.” Com. on 1 Pet. i. 8; ii. 7.

It should be observed that Coleridge substitutes his own definition of “Reason” for that of Leighton; but he applies to understanding what the Archbishop says of *natural reason*; and he attributes to reason, as defined by himself, what Leighton attributes to the enlightening of the Holy Spirit.

† Aids to Reflection. Preface.

summary of the characteristic and peculiar doctrines of Christianity with his account of the process of regeneration.

“Reason is the power of universal and necessary convictions, the source and substance of truth above sense, and having their evidence in themselves. Its presence is always marked by the necessity of the position affirmed. This necessity being conditional when a truth of reason is applied to facts of experience, or to the rules and maxims of the understanding; but absolute, when the subject-matter is itself the growth or offspring of reason. Hence arises a distinction in the reason itself, arising from the different modes of applying it, and from the objects to which it is directed; accordingly as we consider one and the same gift, now as the ground of formal principles, and now as the origin of ideas. Contemplated distinctively in reference to formal (or abstract) truth, it is the speculative reason; but in reference to actual (or moral) truth, as the fountain of ideas, and the light of the conscience, we name it the practical reason. *Whenever, by self-subjection to this universal light, the will of the individual, the particular will, has become a will of reason, the man is regenerate; and reason is then the spirit of the regenerated man, whereby the person is capable of a quickening intercommuning with the Divine Spirit:* and herein consists the mystery of redemption, that this has been rendered possible for us. ‘And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam a quickening

spirit.’* We need only compare the passages in the writings of the apostles Paul and John concerning the Spirit and spiritual gifts with those in the Proverbs and in the Wisdom of Solomon respecting *reason*, to be convinced that the terms are synonymous. In this, at once most comprehensive and most appropriate acceptation of the word, reason is pre-eminently spiritual; and a spirit, even our spirit, though an effluence of the same grace by which we are privileged to say Our Father.”†

The distinction between understanding and reason which Coleridge represents as so “momentous,” and which, indeed, lies at the basis of all modern German philosophies, may be regarded as a question rather of words than of things, or as at best but a new arrangement of what has never been doubted by the great philosophers and theologians of our country. Its tendency is the same with that which pervades alike all speculation of the same class—to confound the terms which stand for the abstract notions of the mind, with the names of substances existing *without* the mind, and to mistake the personifications of poetry for the apprehension of exact truth. The understanding is the mind; the reason is the mind; the will is the mind;—the understanding mind reasons and wills; the reasoning and acting mind understands; the understanding and reasoning mind wills. By representing reason as wisdom, and as synonymous with “the Spirit,”

* 1 Cor. xv. 45.

† Aids to Reflection, pp. 157, 158.

and "Spiritual gifts," Coleridge has taught precisely the same thing—the same inward light, which we have seen to be characteristic of the mystical writers by whom he was preceded. Coleridge himself, we know, would have demurred to this classification, for he says, "when a man refers to inward feelings and experiences of which mankind at large *are not conscious*, as evidences of the *truth of any opinion*, he is a mystic;"* whereas we are proceeding in this Lecture on that wider view of mysticism, in which his definition is included; yet even his own definition of mysticism applies to his description of "the natural man," who "possesses no higher intuitions than those of the pure sense, which are the subjects of mathematical science," and who, therefore, is "not conscious of the inward feelings—the knowledge of Spiritual truth, which is of necessity immediate and intuitive;" for, in the eyes of "the natural man, the world, mankind at large," what but a mystic, according to Coleridge's definition, can he be, who appeals for the truth of his opinion to that immediate and intuitive knowledge of spiritual truths which he enjoys, but which mankind at large do not enjoy?

Coleridge's view of the religious life is scattered through various passages in his writings. Its most definite statements will be found in his *Biographia Literaria*, chap. ix., where he speaks with affec-

* Aids to Reflection, p. 290.

tionate reverence of Boehm, Fox, and others; in his essay on the Prometheus of Æschylus; and in the third Book of his "Aids to Reflection."

The love of the abstruse, of the obscure, and of the antique, seduced this acute and comprehensive thinker to adopt every notion that accorded with his mental habitudes; and, in the zeal with which he opposed the spiritless formality of others, he overlooked, perhaps could not perceive, the fallacies and the evil tendencies of the mysticism to which he lent the sanction of his learning and his genius.*

The whole of this speculative mysticism may be

* I may be allowed to quote, with unfeigned admiration, a note on Hooker's great sermon on the Certainty and Perpetuity of Faith in the Elect:—"I can remember no other discourse that sinks into and draws up comfort from the depths of our being below our distinct consciousness, with the clearness and godly loving-kindness of this truly evangelical, God-to-be-thanked-for sermon. But how large, how important a part of our spiritual life goes on like the circulation, absorptions, and secretions of our bodily life, unrepresented by any specific sensation, and yet the ground and condition of our total scale of existence!"—Remains, vol. iii. p. 519.

To which let me add one sentence from his Nightly Prayer, (1831) where he sums up the gifts for which he "offers up (his) nightly sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving in humble trust that the fragrance of my Saviour's righteousness may remove from it the taint of my mortal corruption, above all for the heavenly Friend, the crucified Saviour, the glorified Mediator, Christ Jesus, and for the heavenly Comforter, source of all abiding comforts, thy Holy Spirit; O grant me the aid of thy Spirit, that I may with a deep faith, a more enkindled love, bless thee, who, through thy Son, hast privileged me to call thee Abba, Father."

analyzed into many separate elements, some of which we shall be required to consider more fully as we proceed; at present it is enough to bear in mind that its primary root is to be found in a particular mode of viewing the faculties of the human spirit, the attributes of the supreme Spirit, and the relation of the one to the other. In the Oriental philosophy it produced pantheism, or emanation; in the Platonic philosophy, a poetical idealism; in the mystics of the Christian church, a highly imaginative conception of the nature of the intercourse between man and God. It is, probably, still the tendency of some speculative minds, dissatisfied with the coldness, formality, heartlessness, and miserable inconsistencies, of the Christianity which may at any time be taught in pulpits, or professed in the world; and when combined, as assuredly it often is, with large intellectual capacity, or with great fervour of devotion, or with both, the emotions awakened by a man's own conscience, or modified by his natural affections, may be honestly mistaken for the direct suggestions of the Spirit of God.

II. CONTEMPLATIVE MYSTICISM proceeds on the assumption of that view of man and of God which, so far as we know, was first propounded systematically in connexion with Christian doctrines by Poiret. Instead of speculating and reasoning, the contemplative mystic takes for granted that the truth lies with those speculative reasoners who represent the spiritual life after a manner which

agrees with the temperament of their own minds, and which seems to be confirmed by the experience of their own internal history. Their doctrine is, that in order to the enjoyment of God we must resign ourselves to passive contemplation, and thus attain to such a state of perfect quietude as shall raise us above the intrusion of the senses, and even of the intellect.

The title of *Quietists* was applied to such persons, and their opinions were denominated Quietism.* It was revived in the seventeenth century by the writings of Molinos, a Spanish ecclesiastic, who established himself at Rome, in the year 1627, and who for twenty years drew after him so numerous

* "So long as the attainment of God is proposed as a process of spiritualization, it is perfectly natural, that, in minds of an enthusiastic or melancholy temperament, a violent effort should be made to realize at once, or approach as nearly as possible, the ultimate end of the aspirant soul. The love of God becomes the sole, exclusive principle of action, not as it is the bond of peace or of all virtues, but as it is in itself the most intense expression of the soul's effort—the condensation of all affections and desires into one divine ardour. The frenzied self-devotion of those saints of the East, who passed their lives on pillars or in caverns, and the Quietism of Fenelon, [the ἡρεμία of the intellect, according to Plato and Aristotle. So Duns Scotus, Sent. iii., dist. xxviii., fol. 56.] were only various instances of the same principle carried to its full extent under different modifications of personal character and circumstances.

"Licet ergo solum infinitum bonum quietet voluntatem; et hoc in quantum infinitum bonum: non tamen oportet quodlibet bonum finitum, secundum gradum suum in bonitate, magis et minus quietare: quia isti gradus sunt accidentales per comparisonem ad extrinsecum quietandum."—Dr. Hampden's Bampton Lectures, p. 282, 3.

a body of followers that he was brought before the Holy Inquisition, on a charge of heresy, and condemned to habitual imprisonment, by Pope Innocent XI. His *Guida*, and some other books, were publicly burned, and the writer was forced to recant his errors before the Sacred College, in the church of the Dominicans.—The doctrine of Molinos might have been forgotten, if it had not been taken up in the famous quarrel between the Jesuits and the Jansenists in France, and supported on the one hand, and opposed on the other, by the most brilliant ornaments of the brilliant court of Louis XIV. Madame Bouvières de la Motte, a native of Montargis, became the wife of a son of Guion, the superintendent of the canal of Briare. In her youth she became a widow ; when, renouncing the society which her fortune, her beauty, and her imagination, might have adorned, she resigned herself to the direction of La Combe, a Barnabite, from Geneva. Under his guidance, she soon became fired with the ambition of resembling the Spanish mystic Saint Theresa. Accompanying her confessor to the vicinity of the titular Bishop of Geneva's country seat, she gained many proselytes by the profusion of her alms, and by the frequency of her spiritual conferences. The bishop drove them both from the neighbourhood. They retired to Grenoble, where Madame Guion published two books, "The New Converts," and "The Torrents." The lady and her confessor were soon obliged to leave Grenoble for Paris. Their teaching in that capital excited so much

attention that the archbishop procured an order from the king to imprison La Combe as a *seducteur*, and to shut up Madame Guion in a convent.

Madame Guion enjoyed the favour of Madame Maintenon, the private wife of Louis XIV., a lady distinguished for the interest she took in religious disputations, as well as for her munificence in the foundation of a school for the girls of poor noble families at St. Cyr. In this way Madame Guion became known to Fenelon, at that time the tutor of the royal children. The taste and sensibility of Fenelon preferred the sublime and tender to the darker and severer departments of Theology. In Madame Guion he found a congenial spirit; and she, emboldened by his protection, was soon actively engaged in diffusing her opinions at St. Cyr. The bishop of Chartres complained, and the archbishop of Paris threatened to renew his prosecution. Madame Maintenon withdrew her countenance. The Abbé de Fenelon advised his friend to submit her writings to the judgment of Bossuet, the bishop of Meaux. Fenelon was now promoted to the archbishopric of Cambry. Bossuet, who is represented as having become jealous of the high reputation of his former disciple, urged the archbishop to join with him in condemning Madame Guion. The archbishop would neither belie his convictions, nor betray his friend; but when he proceeded to his new diocese, he published at Paris his "*Maxims of the Saints* on the Inward Life," in which he vindicated Madame Guion and the orthodoxy of the

Quietists. Bossuet and his friends denounced the archbishop's book to the king. Madame Guion was sent, first of all, to a prison at Vincennes, where she solaced herself by writing mystic poetry; and from thence she was transferred to the Bastile. Bossuet wrote against Fenelon; and so great a stir was made at court, and in the city, that both writers sent their works to await the decision of Pope Innocent XII. Le Père de la Chaise, the royal confessor, dared not advocate Fenelon's cause before the king; and Madame Maintenon abandoned him. The king himself wrote a letter to the pope informing him that the book of the archbishop of Cambray had been presented to him as a pernicious work; but that he referred it to the judgment of his holiness.

The examiners appointed by the pope held thirty-seven conferences on thirty-seven propositions in the "Maxims of the Saints," and the majority judged them to be erroneous. The pope, assisted by a congregation of cardinals, issued his brief of condemnation. Fenelon submitted: he even condemned his own book publicly, in the pulpit of his cathedral. In the same year Madame Guion was permitted to remove to Blois, where she died twelve years after, still breathing the sentiments for which she had laboured and suffered.

According to the most eminent French writers, the Quietists of that age and country regarded true happiness as consisting in a total vacancy of mind. "In the three fold silence," says Bruyère,

“of words, of thoughts, and of desires, they find a spiritual dream, a mystic intoxication, or rather a mystic death; all their suspended powers are called from the circumference to the centre. God, who is the centre, makes himself known to the soul by Divine touches, by tastes, by gentle illapses, and ineffable sweetnesses. Their affections being thus moved, the soul sinks into a delicious repose which rises above all delights, all ecstasies, all notions, all divine speculations: a state in which she knows neither what she feels, nor what she is.”*

It is to be recollected that La Bruyere was a protégé of Bossuet, and that his object in his dialogues on mysticism, was to ridicule the notions of his patron's rival. Yet the proofs which he furnished are sufficient to show that, after making due allowance for the colouring of the writer's wit and fancy, the outlines and some essential features of Quietism in France are given.†

But a candid study of the writings of the mystic Quietists will show that the repose which they prized so highly, was not so much that negative absorption which their enemies derided, as a transcendent state of the devout affections towards God,

* La Bruyère, Dialogue II. Sur la Quietisme, p. 33. These dialogues were not published by La Bruyère, but, after his death by L. E. Dupin.

† There is a long and ably written paper of the Chevalier de Jancourt on this subject in the *Encyclopedie*, tom. XIII., p. 709. The History of Quietism has been written in France by Philippeaux, and others.

which, as they thought, was kindled while contemplating His perfections, by the immediate energy of the Holy Spirit.

Somewhat earlier than the appearance of the continental mystic writings which we have been noticing, Lord Edward Herbert, baron of Cherbury, brother of George Herbert, the well-known poet, published his "*Tractatus de Veritate*, prout distinguitur a revelatione, a verisimili, a possibili, et a falso." In this remarkable work there are some philosophical speculations which afterwards reappeared in the idealism of Kant, and in the mysticism of Jacobi; but we now refer to it, as containing mystical notions of the spiritual life, and especially for the purpose of introducing one fact in connexion with the publication of the work, showing how nearly his lordship, while rejecting the Christian revelation, agreed with other mystics of the same and of the following times, in ascribing his religious knowledge to an inward light from heaven. Though his treatise *De Veritate* had received the approbation of Grotius and of other eminently learned men, he hesitated to give it to the world, because of the opposition he expected it would provoke. "Being thus doubtful," he says, "in my chamber, one fair day in the summer, my casement being open towards the south, the sun shining clear, and no wind stirring, I took my book *De Veritate* in my hands, and kneeling on my knees, devoutly said these words: 'O thou eternal God, author of this light which now shines upon

me, and giver of all inward illuminations; I do beseech thee of thine infinite goodness, to pardon a greater request than a sinner ought to make; I am not satisfied enough whether I should publish this book; if it be for thy glory, I beseech thee give me some sign from heaven; if not, I shall suppress it.' I had no sooner spoken these words, but a loud, though yet gentle, noise, came forth from the heavens (for it was like nothing on earth) which did so cheer and comfort me, that I took my petition as granted, and that I had the sign which I demanded; whereupon also I resolved to print my book. This, how strange soever it may seem, I protest before the eternal God is true: neither am I any way superstitiously deceived herein: since I did not only clearly hear the noise, but in the serenest sky that ever I saw, being without all cloud, did, to my thinking, see the place from whence it came."*

As in all times of peculiar religious excitement, so, in the middle of the seventeenth century, the renunciation of external forms and acknowledged creeds was accompanied by a vigorous manifestation of the mysticism of which we are treating. The ancient notion that the human soul is an

* *Memoirs of Himself*, by Lord Herbert, printed at Horace Walpole's private press, Strawberry Hill, 1764. Leland's view of Deistical Writers. Letter second—postscript. Hallam's *History of Literature in Europe*. Vol. ii. p. 381. Baxter wrote some animadversions on this treatise, which are contained in the xxi. vol. of his collected works.

emanation of God had been gradually exchanged for the belief that *a direct revelation of divine truth was made to every man*. Men were told that by following this inward light, and quietly waiting upon God, they would be illumined, purified, and redeemed; and the language of the Scriptures was largely quoted in support of the opinion, and in vindication of the practices which it encouraged.*

III. IMAGINATIVE MYSTICISM is not so much a distinct form, as the common element, of mysticism, in whatever form it may appear. It is less the invention of what is new and false than the perversion of what is old and true. It ascribes to immediate revelation the thoughts and emotions

* This inward light was spoken of as "the eternal word;" "the divine grace," "the seed of God," "the Bible written in the heart," "the talent," "the little leaven," "the Gospel preached to every creature," by which "God strives with every man in order to save him," "the foundation of Christianity," "a spiritual, heavenly, and invisible principle, in which God, as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, dwells, a measure of which divine and glorious life is in all men,"—"a real spiritual substance, which comes upon all at certain times and seasons, when it works powerfully upon the soul, mightily tenders and breaks it, at which time, if man resist it not, but closes with it, he comes to know salvation by it"—"the word of the kingdom," "the implanted or engrafted word," "the power of God unto salvation," "the inward manifestation of the knowledge of God," "light and grace in the heart, from whence the new creation proceeds," "the letter and incorruptible seed in every man and woman's heart," in which "the kingdom of Jesus Christ, yea, Jesus Christ himself is ready to be brought forth, as it is cherished and received in the love of it."—Barclay's Apology for the true Christian Divinity. Sixth edition in English. 1736.

which are natural, in given circumstances, to the human mind. It results from the preponderance of the imagination over the judgment, catching at resemblances, but blind to differences; mistaking feeling for evidence, and clothing the creations of the fancy with the authority of truth.—In religious affairs, we observe the working of imaginative mysticism in two memorable departments; in the allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures, and in the pretence, or the belief, of new revelations.

(1.) The mystical interpretation of the Scriptures is as old as the history of Christianity; and while it may be chargeable, in great part, on the mental peculiarities of certain interpreters, and on the ambition which led others to display their ingenuity in discovering something new and wonderful in the sacred writings, there is little difficulty in ascribing a large portion of it to the general characteristics of the oriental mind, and to exaggerated inferences from the typical design of the Hebrew worship, from the symbolic poetry of the ancient prophecies, and from the occasional allegories of the New Testament. It is usual to ascribe the system of interpreting the Scriptures in a mystical sense to Philo the Jew, who applied the eastern theosophy, and the philosophy of the later Platonists, to the explanation of the books of Moses. Holding the notion which we have seen to be held in common by all mystics—that God reveals Himself immediately to those who have purified their minds by the contemplation of His essence—and anxious to hold

a middle course between contemplative spiritualists and adherents to the literal meaning of every part of the Pentateuch, he grafted on the literal sense of the inspired writings a higher and a “spiritual” meaning. The Christian interpreters, deeply imbued with feelings which belong to the very life of Christianity, were carried over the boundaries of their judgment, and, as in many other cases of human infirmity, they pushed the principle of allegorical exposition far beyond the range in which it had been sanctioned by the inspired apostles.—We can refer now only in general terms to the Epistle ascribed to Barnabas;—the Pastor of Hermes;—the spiritualising of Rahab’s scarlet thread, which occurs in so many of the fathers;—the familiar allegories of Justin, and the other Greek apologists;—the mystic power of the *gnosis*, or principle by which the more advanced Christians were to explain the mysteries of the Scripture, advocated by Clemens of Alexandria; Origen’s adaptation of the Scriptures to the threefold division of men into body, soul, and spirit;—Gregory of Nyssa’s “Spiritual Homilies” on the Canticles;—the fanciful Commentaries of Hilary;—the extravagant puerilities of Ambrose;—the occasional incoherences of Jerome;—the scientific allegories of Augustine;—the minute and jejune conceits of the Alexandrian Cyril;—the obscure imaginings of Gregory the Great;—the pleasant Gleanings of Bede;—the poetical elevations of Maurus; the ingenuities of the Dominican Hugo de St. Caro;—the dark sayings

of Bonaventura, the *seraphic doctor*;—the mystic pertinacity of Paulus Burgensis;—the Cabalistic “forms” of Reuchlin;—the ingenious spiritualising of Bunyan on Solomon’s temple;—M’Ewen’s detailed explanation of Types;—Brown’s parallels of Old Testament facts with the History of the Jews;—Gill’s Rabbinical lore applied to the Biblical text; and numberless imitators, of meaner name, who, for a time, have drawn toward themselves a large share of popular admiration as peculiarly deep and “spiritual” teachers.

(2.) In the above class of mystics, we should be disposed to assign a somewhat conspicuous place to Emmanuel Swedenborg, if we regarded him *merely* as an expositor of the Scriptures; but as he ascribes his spiritual interpretations to a special source, he will probably occupy a more distinct and appropriate place, if we now advert to him as believing and teaching that God had made him the vehicle of new revelations. He received his education from his father, a bishop of the Swedish church, at Stockholm. His youthful genius and assiduity were signalized by publishing, in his twentieth year, a volume of miscellaneous poetry in Latin. After he had travelled for four or five years in England, France, Holland, and Germany, he devoted himself, under the patronage of King Charles the Twelfth, to the study of mathematics and the physical sciences, in which he made such progress that his name was enrolled with honours in the Academy of St. Petersburg, as well as in those of his own country;

and his friendship and correspondence were sought by some of the most eminent philosophers of Europe. Ten years after he had reached the zenith of his scientific fame, (by the publication of his “Opera Philosophica et Mineralia,” in three folio volumes,) he believed that the Lord himself was manifested to him in a personal appearance; and that he opened to him “the Spiritual” world, enabling him to converse with spirits and angels, and revealing to him the sacred things of heaven and hell, the states of the dead, the spiritual sense of Scripture, and many other secrets relating to the worship of God, to true wisdom, and to human salvation. His view of the spiritual life is slowly and formally developed, in a series of propositions spread over a large quarto volume.*

Each of these propositions is argued at length, from passages of Scripture, “spiritually” interpreted, and copious natural analogies, “spiritually” explained. The source whence Swedenborg professed to derive both his philosophy and his theology was a species of illumination by which he imagined himself to be admitted into the spiritual world. Some of his “*arcana*” which he gives in a series of “Memorable Relations” are more entertaining than any other part of his writings; they abound with beautiful scenes and happy metaphors; but they are remarkable for their contrast, both in matter and in

* True Christian Religion, containing the Universal Theology of the New Church. Third Edition. London. 1795.

manner, with the "visions and revelations of the Lord" which are contained in the Holy Scriptures.

It is a curious question in psychology,—how came it to pass that a man so intelligent and so virtuous as Swedenborg should indulge in such vagaries? The very closeness of his studies, the extent of his knowledge of nature, the consciousness of rare mental activity, and the speculative imagination with which he came to the study of the Scriptures, may have produced only their natural fruit in the peculiar turn given to his enthusiasm as the founder of a "New Church."

Imaginative mystics in general, the dreamers of dreams, and the seers of visions, have usually been either followed, or ridiculed: the zeal of one party, and the derision of the other, have operated with almost equal and antagonist force to preserve their celebrity. There is another way, however, of looking at these deviations from the even tenour of men's lives. Few persons are so enthusiastic as to attempt such an impossibility as that of following *every* mystic light that startles this benighted world; and the wittiest scorner would scarcely fling his sarcasms with the same confidence of success on the entire visionary host. Moreover there is some danger—formerly, at least, there has been—of assailing through the feeble impostures, or hallucinations, of modern times, the most sacred persons and the most awful truths. Both the lovers of the marvellous, and those whose dread of the ludicrous is most sensitive, would do well to consider how many

ways there are in which the fever of the imagination may be mistaken for the suggestions of heaven, and calmly to distinguish the simplicity, dignity, and practical good sense of the original Christian *witnesses*, from the wildness, folly, or uselessness of even those pretended revelations which are condemned by their contradiction to the Scriptures, or their incompatibility with our moral judgments. We need not here exhibit the natural history of dreams, of insanity, and of those delicate shadings which fill up the undefined space between the healthiest and the most disordered condition of the mental functions. It is enough to know that abnormal states of the mind are nearly as common as distempers of the body; that they are not unfrequently due to material disturbances; and that there is no law of our nature to prevent their assuming the character of religious enthusiasm as easily as any other character which sane observers know to be illusive. It may be that our science has not yet laid bare *all* the causes of such mental aberrations; yet the experience of mankind has not been acquired without affording ample means for testing the soundness of men's minds.

The sobriety displayed by imaginative persons on all subjects but one, is so far from being singular, that it may almost be laid down as a general characteristic. Intelligence concerning matters not belonging to the case in hand, is no proof whatever that a person's own consciousness should be accepted as a sufficient evidence of his supernatural illumination; for the

question is not,—whether he really feels in the particular way which he professes, but, simply, whether he reasons soundly in believing that such feelings come to him from heaven, and whether other persons are wise in agreeing with him in this conclusion. Not a step is taken in support of a man's claim to immediate divine teaching, when testimonies are given to the goodness of his personal character; for very good men have been overborne by affliction in all its mysterious shapes, and some of them have sunk beneath the heaviest of them all—the total derangement of the intellectual faculties. Let it be added, that the copious information, the powerful reasoning, or the august truths, which have so often been enunciated in the noblest words by persons who believed themselves to be inspired, are no *proofs* of their being inspired, whenever it can be shown that these attainments were not beyond the reach of their natural powers excited by causes acting either from within, or from without. The only point with which we have to do, at present, is the well-known fact,—that among the strange freaks which the imagination has been known to play when she gains the ascendant, a man may come to persuade himself that his imaginings are real facts external to his mind; and it is only by the inference of an already deluded judgment that he concludes this imagined reality to have been shown to him from heaven. We leave out of this inquiry all cases of imposture; but we should have only an exceedingly imperfect appre-

hension of the subject, were we to omit all reference to the *moral* preparations for self-delusion which many a visionary has been making, by overweening reliance on himself; by the vanity which any kind of admiration is so apt to inflate; by indulging in the habit of mental creations; by brooding over obscure yet stimulating themes; by indulging in morbid dissatisfaction with the state of things around him; by impatience at the slow procedures of the unseen Ruler; or by the strong desire,—like other desires, evil only in its perversion or excess—to say or do some great thing to bring this world into a state which shall be worthy of the gaze of angels, and welcomed by the smile of God.

When such sentiments become habitual to a man whose temperament is sensitive, and whose imagination is strong in proportion to his other mental aptitudes, it would be more difficult to show what could prevent his being a religious visionary, than to explain how he becomes one.

IV. PRACTICAL MYSTICISM is displayed by all those who act from *impulses* which they ascribe to the motions of the Holy Spirit. As speculation seduces the imagination, so does imagination touch the feelings: and the feelings thus produced by the ordinary laws of our mental nature are easily misapprehended by the ignorant, the vain, or the superstitious, for the direct impulse of the Spirit of God. It would require much longer time than we have now at our disposal to exhibit the workings

of this delusion among the fakirs of the east ; in the anchorites of the early church ; in the moody fancies of the cloister, throughout the middle ages ; in the gorgeous exploits of the Crusades ; in the various missions wherein, from early times, the passionate energy of individuals, or the sympathetic enthusiasm of brotherhoods, have performed their marvellous deeds ; and in the calm yet terrible fanaticism of the Holy Inquisition. We wish to come to more distinct examples.

(1.) History has told, for the warning of all coming ages, the lessons of the Peasants' War in Germany. Originating in the fierce passions which oppression wakens in the heart of an excited people, this social discontent included among its grievances not a few of the gigantic evils against which the reformers were contending ; but the crimes of the insurgents, their spirit, and their whole proceedings, were so entirely at variance with the principles and objects of Luther, that he left his Patmos, as he called the Castle of Wartburg, to quench, if possible, the first sparks ; by speech, by writing, and by every kind of influence at his command, to dissuade them ; and, failing in that, to overwhelm them by main force. In the course of that wide-spreading enthusiasm a religious fanatic became the ruling spirit. So long ago as the thirteenth century, the Beghards had begun in Germany the austerities revived in the fifteenth century by the Flagellants, who substituted the voluntary lashing of their own flesh for the sacra-

ments of the church, and the flames of purgatory. The memory of these enthusiasts still lingered amid the mountains of the Hartz, and the forests of Thuringia, when Münzer headed a band of new apostles who harangued the populace at Zwickhau in the Ertzgebirge, as the inspired messengers of God, assuming to themselves the title of "Celestial Prophets." Münzer preached against the doctrines of Luther as not being sufficiently "spiritual," as being no better than "a fabulous gospel;" and on the hills of Meissen and Thuringia he boldly declared that ungodly rulers, especially priests and monks, should be put to death. He stirred up the people to found large cannons, and to storm the convents, castles, and farm-houses, of the whole country. To the miners of Mansfeld he said: "Give no heed to the wailings of the ungodly; let not the blood cool on your swords; lay Nimrod on the anvil, and let it ring lustily with your blows; cast his strong tower to the earth while it is yet day."*

When the princes brought out their forces against this armed mass of peasants at Frankenhäusen, the first discharge of their artillery was

* "In this fanatic the mystical notions of former ages were blended with the tendencies toward ecclesiastical and temporal reform which had just arisen: out of this combination he formed a set of opinions which addressed themselves immediately to the common people; incited them to rise and annihilate the whole order of things; and prepared the way for the absolute sway of a prophet."—*Ranke's History of the Reformation*, vol. ii. p. 241. Second Edit.

answered by the hymn "*Veni Spiritus*;" but the singers were ill-provided with human means of defence: most of them were slain; the remainder fled in consternation, spreading terror in their flight. Münzer was beheaded in the camp before the town of Mülhausen, where he had sat in court deciding causes by pretended revelation. In the hour of death, and while in the pangs of torture before his execution, he was upbraided with the crime of drawing such a multitude of ignorant followers to destruction; he broke into a savage laugh and said: "They would have it so."

(2.) Let us turn to a fanatic of the same time, in another land, whose personal doings were of a different order, and whose genius has survived, through all the convulsions of modern Europe, to this day.

The chivalrous spirit of the Spaniards was not, like that of other nations, exhausted by the wars of the cross in Palestine. It was inflamed by their splendid conquests in Mexico and Peru, and by their triumphant struggles with the Moors. The old national romaunt of *Amadis de Gaula* was revived, and fed the fancies of the young and brave Castilians, whose thoughts were all of love and tournaments, of brilliant arms, and prancing steeds, and martial glory. These inspirations were felt by none more strongly than by a young poet of high birth and breeding in the court of Ferdinand. While suffering from wounds received in the defence of Pampeluna against the attack of

Francis I. of France, he cheered his solitary anguish by meditating on the Amadis and on tales of Paladins. To these he added the reading of the life of Christ; and to that the legends of St. Francis and St. Dominic, and similar heroes of the church. His incurable lameness unfitted him for going on in the career which he had begun. His mind fell a prey to its own fantasies. Pictures of spiritual grandeur were painted on the clouds that darkened his military prospects; he now looked to Christ as a champion, to Jerusalem as a camp; and his soul was consumed by a passion to surpass all the saints and warriors he read of, in the severity of their penances, or in the lustre of their exploits. Fired with thoughts like these, he was no sooner strong enough to leave his couch, than he forsook his home for a hermitage in the rocks of Montserrat, where he suspended his lance and his shield before the image of the virgin, and imitated the vigil of Amadis by offering his vows and prayers as he leaned on a pilgrim's staff. Exchanging the accoutrements of a knight for the rough garb of one of the hermits of St. Benedict, he shut himself up in a cell of the Dominican convent at Mauresa. There he wasted his frame by midnight watchings, by long prayers, and by self-inflicted tortures thrice a day. He made long, repeated, and minute, confessions of all the sins he could force up from the depths of his memory. In these dark hours of misery, neither confessions, nor penances, nor absolutions, nor prayers, nor psalms, could allay

the agonies of conscience which turned every remembrance of life into a sting of death. The dreams of his imagination were chased away by the stern realities of self-knowledge. He was sorely tempted to cast himself from the window of his cell. At one time, he had thoughts of returning to the pleasures of the world; but at another, he resolved to efface his haunting recollections by some strong effort of his will. Then a new change came over him. While in the depth of his inward torment, an aged woman had told him that Christ would appear to him. For a while he had no vision; but at length as he stood one day on the steps of the convent and wept aloud, he believed that Christ was revealed to his mortal eyes; that he saw the dread mysteries of the Trinity, of the creation, and of the Word incarnate—in mystic symbols. Soon after this, he sat on the banks of the Lobregat, gazing intently on its deep and flowing waters, when he suddenly beheld, as he said, the mystery of Faith. From this time he became another man, the author of the “*Spiritual Exercises*,” and the founder of the order of the Jesuits. It was Ignatius Loyola.

It is worthy of remark that not only the general tendency out of which Mysticism arose, but even most of the specific forms which it assumed, in the seventeenth century, on the European continent and in England, may be traced in the long-forgotten works of ancient Monks. The inward light—the special revelations—the spiritual objection to outward sacra-

ments and to music—the instantaneous enjoyment of perfection, and many other peculiarities of modern sects, may be found in the *Monumenta Ecclesiæ Græciæ*. The reader who has not access to that noble collection may consult, with much advantage, Neander's General History of the Christian Religion and Church, volume iii. sec. 3.

In reviewing the phases of mysticism which have passed thus rapidly before us, it will be seen that the workings of the *mind* of *man*, his thoughts, his feelings, and his fancies, have been taken for revelations from God. Whether in the speculations of the thoughtful, in the raptures of the contemplative, in the visions of the imaginative, or in the movements of the fanatical, this is the common error, acting in various ways according to the temperament of individuals, the tendencies of national character, and the opinions and the spirit of distinctly marked eras in the progress of society. We see, in nearly all of them, that it is not always in the weak-minded, nor in the worthless, that such illusions find their natural element, however much the followers of the original enthusiasts may be open to such a charge. The modern mystics, like those of earlier times, have, for the most part, been persons of considerable genius; some, giving the most solid proofs of sincere devotion: not a few, indeed, with the advantages of high discipline and varied learning. The misrepresentations of their enemies have been too credulously accepted. The writings of Madame Bourignon discover large

acquaintance with the world, and a deep insight into the workings of human motives; her language is singularly forcible and clear; and her denunciations of the hollowness of the religion everywhere professed around her, are often just, and always full of power.

The works of Poiret have scarcely ever been excelled, in logical exactitude. Jacob Boehm was a philosopher, a poet, a rhetorician, wanting the elegance which a better education might have given him; and a man of gentle spirit and of blameless life. Of Fenelon we need not speak. Madame Guion was devoted to God, with a soul of extraordinary sensibility, soaring on the wings of an extatic imagination, and pouring forth, whether in poetry or in prose, torrents of overbearing eloquence. Barclay was a gentleman, a scholar, a Christian, a man as eminent for his integrity and intelligence as for his elaborate defence of the persecuted people with whom he threw in his lot. Of the later German mysticism, properly so called, we dare not speak otherwise than as *one of the modern forms of infidelity*; yet the better aspects of even this dark sentimentalism may not have been without their influence on Spener, and Arndt, and Francke, and the Pietists, whose earnest faith still lives to rebuke the arrogance and the irreligiousness both of critics and of philosophers, with more speculative intelligence, perhaps,—as was needed—than the preachers and writers of the evangelical school who have guided the devotions and the enterprises of our own

energetic people, for the last hundred years. But between the Mystics on the one hand, and the Pietists on the other, there have always been these two capital distinctions,—the former sought within their own minds, what the latter have found in the Gospel ; and the mystics embraced a theory which encouraged men's dependence on themselves in *that particular* wherein the pietists have been taught to rely, simply and entirely, on the grace of God. It is not the worth of *feeling*, or even of imagination in religion which is discarded by what we hold to be the Christianity of the new covenant, but—reliance on feeling as the standard of truth, or as the rule of life.

LECTURE VI.

THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF SPIRITUAL LIFE IN HARMONY WITH DIVINE REVELATION.

“SEEING YE HAVE PURIFIED YOURSELVES IN OBEYING THE TRUTH THROUGH THE SPIRIT UNTO UNFEIGNED LOVE OF THE BRETHREN, LOVE ONE ANOTHER WITH A PURE HEART FERVENTLY : BEING BORN AGAIN NOT OF CORRUPTIBLE SEED, BUT OF INCORRUPTIBLE, BY THE WORD OF GOD, WHICH LIVETH AND ABIDETH FOR EVER.”—1 Pet. i. 22, 23.

GREAT is the mystery of Life. It is beyond the reach of man's philosophy. No one has yet explained the principle which distinguishes the lowest species of moss from every form of unorganized matter. As we pass from the creations of the vegetable kingdom, that which moves the animalcule, the insect, the breathing and self-acting occupants of the air, the water, or the earth, is of a higher order.

The reasoning choice which ennobles man is higher than them all. In contemplating man's spiritual life, therefore, we are prepared to expect, as in truth we find, that in whatever way his restoration to God begins, its earliest proofs must appear in the orderly action of those mental func-

tions which have been perverted by sin. However it might be with some imaginary being, we can conceive of man only as intelligent and active: intelligent that he may act; and acting according to the direction and the degree of his intelligence.

We do not reason out, in theory, the origin of spiritual life. Neither do we detect the cause of spiritual life by our own consciousness. What we know on this subject is neither more nor less than that which God has taught us in those passages of His word which have been brought forward in a previous Lecture. But when a man begins to live to God, he is conscious of that which is new in the tendency of his voluntary thoughts, in his emotions, in his practical purposes, in the whole interior of that world which no eye can see except his own, and that eye to which all things are laid open. The testimony of the human consciousness is the testimony of one of these witnesses: the testimony of the word of God is the testimony of the other; and in this respect, as in every other, the witnesses agree.

The error of mysticism lies in making a use of the human consciousness for which it is incompetent, for which it is not intended, and to which it is utterly inapplicable. The mind is not its own standard of religious believing; nor its own rule of religious living. Excepting in those cases which have borne indisputable signs of extraordinary illumination — such signs as those which, as we have already proved, separated the prophets and

apostles of the Bible from all other men—it has always been to an *outward* revelation that men have been directed for the knowledge of what is true, and for the knowledge of what is right, in connection with salvation. That the mind of man may arrive without an external revelation at some knowledge of his relation to God, some recognition of his social and religious duties, is a truth which admits not, as we conceive, of any reasonable doubt; and indeed we cannot understand, on any other principle, the reasonings of the apostle Paul in the beginning of his Epistle to the Romans.*

On the same ground, we are assured, a man may be convicted of sinfulness, and self-condemned, independently of any knowledge of the Gospel. We are warranted to go even further, and to say—that the history of man, on its smallest, and on its largest, scale, abounds with so many proofs of divine forbearance towards sinners, that the self-condemned man cannot look seriously on his own experience, and on the general experience of mankind, without catching some glimpses of the great truth—that God is gracious as well as just. But the granting of a revelation implies that without a knowledge of the particular truths revealed, man must be in the dark on that which is to him the most weighty and the most pressing of all questions—How can I be pardoned and renewed by

* See Wardlaw's Essay on the Responsibility of the Heathen : and Letters to the Society of Friends.

Him who has condemned me? To remove this darkness—not to gratify intellectual speculation, nor merely to enforce the demands of moral government,—is the *specific design* of the truths concerning man, and God, and the salvation of man by God, which constitute the Gospel. In revealing these truths, the Holy Spirit, as we have formerly shown, is our religious teacher.—The case of those whom His teaching in the Gospel has not reached, has been treated variously; at present, we are not concerned with it any further than to say—that the limited propagation of the Gospel cannot be an argument against its divinity, unless the limitation of good, in other respects, is a proof that God is not benevolent; and that in connection with this fact we fear there will be terrible disclosures in the day of judgment, on which it were well for Christians to meditate with thoughtfulness, and contrition, and with such purposes as will be most congenial with their religion, and most honourable to their own profession of that religion.—The case of infants we can cheerfully leave to God.—What we have now to do is—to observe what a man is conscious of doing in his mind, when he believes and obeys the Gospel, and to show the harmony of this consciousness with what the Spirit has taught us in the Gospel, respecting these doings of the mind of man.

We here propose to examine:—First, the testimony of human consciousness to the mental actions of the spiritual life:—Secondly, the declarations of

Scripture on the same subject:—and Thirdly, the principal explanations which theologians have given of this matter.

I. We shall report as faithfully and accurately as we are able, THE TESTIMONY OF HUMAN CONSCIOUSNESS TO THE MENTAL ACTINGS OF SPIRITUAL LIFE.

(1.) He who receives the Gospel as God's message of salvation is conscious of regarding what the Gospel thus makes known, as *said to him by the Holy Spirit*. He knows, indeed, that the narratives of the Saviour's life, death, resurrection, and ascension, are given to him in the form of authentic human history; that the general truths, or doctrines, which expound the meaning of those facts as they bear on our salvation, are addressed to him in the recorded discourses of preachers, and in the epistles of five of the apostles; but he also knows, as the Saviour had promised, and as the apostles proved, that the evangelical histories, discourses, and instructions, of the New Testament are given by inspiration, and that the human authors are, herein, the ministers of the Holy Spirit. For this reason, it has not been unusual among the elder theologians to call the faith of a Christian a divine faith, inasmuch as it is not faith in man only, but faith in God.—The natural aptitude for truth which belongs to the constitution of man is met by a great variety of sources, indications, or means of truth; and the native energy of the mind is shown in the promptitude, vigour, and constancy, with which it lays hold of truth, from whatever quarter it may

come, in whatever way it is attained. The fundamental truths of all are in our consciousness itself, in the universal tendencies and laws of our intellectual nature. Our knowledge of the facts which surround us is gained through the senses ; but our knowledge of the relation of these facts to one another—the exact knowledge which has emphatically received the name of science—is acquired by reasoning, according to the inevitable laws of our being, from the facts which we observe. Our knowledge of facts beyond the sphere of our observation is derived from the knowledge of those who have observed them, or from the inevitable propensity to analogy, which observation has hitherto either corrected or confirmed. Our confidence in the testimony of others is one example of the law of analogy, relying on their observation and on their veracity in reporting what they know. On such testimony, tried and approved, the most enlightened Christians partly rest their belief of the *historical* truth of the Christian narratives : partly, not wholly ; for their chief reliance is on the truthfulness of the narratives themselves, on the character of the facts which they record, and on the correspondence of those facts with all that they themselves know to be true, and with all that they find, in themselves, or in others, of the effects of so believing. But, having settled it in their minds that the Gospel is of God, their *Christian* faith begins in regarding the Gospel as true, because it is divine. They have reasons for this. Some

are able to state these reasons clearly, logically, and with force; while others, whose faith is not less intelligent, and rational, and vital, are not so able to expound to others their reasons for believing. No Christian believes anything—simply as a Christian on matters pertaining to his salvation—for which the best possible reason cannot be rendered, if not by himself, yet by some of his fellow-Christians. There is no law of the human intellect violated, or even strained, by any portion of the belief of which every Christian is conscious. What he believes is that which he thinks of as true; holds as true; values as true; uses as true; enjoys as true; and his reason for thinking thus is—that God himself hath so taught him in that word to which he can appeal, at all times, and in the face of all gain-sayers. With him, divine truth is no speculation—no conclusion from formal reasoning—no authoritative article in a creed composed by fellow-men—no fancied private revelation; but the open, public, and attested declaration of the living God. His mind may, indeed, have gathered many accretions round this central and divine truth; and he may have been so educated as to confound the one with the other; but this is the imperfection of his humanity, not the essential irrationality of his belief.

There is in him a light which in the unbeliever there is not; and this light he knows from his own consciousness, has not been discovered: it is revealed; it is not his own conjecture, but the

truth which has come to him from heaven. It is the light that shows him "things not seen," that brings the distant near; that gives to the future the value of the present; that enables him to set the realities of eternity against the vanities of time, and to see how dim the brightest things of earth become when contrasted with the glories of heaven. In proportion to the vivacity of his power of picturing to himself the objects with which his senses are not familiar, his views of God, of salvation, of immortality, acquire that vividness and power with which Moses lived "as seeing him who is invisible;" the things of which he has no knowledge but by his faith in God become to him as substantial, and his regard for them becomes as confident, as the perceptions of his senses, or as the routine of his daily life. It is as though he looked into a mirror which reflects from afar the higher beauties and richer treasures of the universe; or as though, on the shore of mortality, some sacred rock reverberated to his ear the sounds that come over the deep abyss between him and the immortal. He breathes, it is true, the air of earth, lives on its fruits, smiles in its sunshine, and shudders in its storms; but his faith in God assures him of a higher sphere, where the vintage never fails, and where all is peace and gladness.

He knows that he is an offender against the Supreme Majesty, that he has no excuse to offer, no plea to urge; but his faith in God assures him of the grace of pardon through that Mediator who

is at once his Brother and his Lord. He dares not think of being present—consciously, as well as actually, present—in the assembly of the righteous and the holy before God in His own temple, with a heart so unclean, so earthly, as he knows his own to be; but his faith in God assures him of a power to take his uncleanness all away, and to transform him into a perfect saint. All this the believer of the Gospel *thinks*. He thinks all this because he believes the things which the Spirit of God has taught him.

(2.) It is an ancient saying, “As a man thinketh, so is he.” The man makes the thought. The thought shows the man. The spiritual thinking which we call believing, produces, as all serious and earnest thinking is sure to do, its corresponding effects on *the emotions of our nature*. Though it be true that our emotions are not the sources of religious belief, nor the guides of religious life, it is not less true that, when the revealed truth of God has become the mind’s law in all the thoughts which relate to our salvation, there is no apathy. Whatever allowance Christian candour is required to make for varieties in human temperament, for the effects produced by the training of early life, or for the hardening processes of worldly experience, we cannot well conceive of a human mind with no susceptibility of emotion: in that degree in which the susceptibility exists, it is the mind’s own thought that touches it.

The Christian belief is not a creed carved with

steel on marble. It is not the fossil of a former age laid up in a museum. It is not the galvanic shock of a dead nerve. It is a living belief, the present believing of one who is now alive to God. It is believing in Christ. Christ was no stranger to human emotion. He was himself a man of tenderness, of condescension, of love, of sorrow, of sympathy. You see it in His looks; you hear it in His words; you feel it as you read the brief but suggestive story of His childhood—of His manhood—and of His death! He shows it to you, if you only go along with Him, in the vigils of the night, and in the labours of the day. His miracles attest it; so do His tears; so do His prayers; so does His cross. Jesus felt because He thought—thought those thoughts with which our Christian believing has to do. Jesus felt strongly, because He thought deeply. This is vital Christianity. The ignorant and the shallow feel because others feel: it is but a copy—an echo. The believer whose mind is full of the truth which the Spirit teaches in the Gospel, will feel most intensely when he is by himself, because he is apt to think most intensely then. The deep river moves with power. The solitary star gives splendour to the heavens. To believe God is to think Divine thoughts. To believe Christ is to think Christian thoughts. To believe the Holy Ghost is to think spiritual thoughts. Now it is our nature's law, that thoughts which are Divine, Christian, and spiritual, should awaken appropriate emotions. And so we

find it. The believer's mind is *humble*; because he thinks of himself, not according to the vanity of his own bosom, or the flattery of a deceitful world, but according to the truth of God. He is *contrite*: for how can he look with an unbroken heart on the love he has injured? He is *grateful*; for he owes "his own soul" to mercy. He is *confiding*; for the arm that never tires is held out to him on purpose that he may lean upon it, and find how strong it is, when he is at the weakest. He is *patient*; for he knows, with an assured faith, that the promises on which he is resting cannot fail. He is *loving*; because he is loved. He is *joyful*; because he remembers that God is his portion, and a mansion in the heavenly house is his inheritance. Let a man be only a believer of what the Spirit of God says—not a speculator—not a formalist—not a mystic—but a believer of what the Spirit says, plainly and with authority, in the Gospel—and it is as natural for him to feel all this as it is for him who believes in the polarity of the magnet to follow its guidance on the trackless waters.

(3.) The believer is conscious of finding in the Gospel *the reasons which induce him to act in a way which is different from the way of unbelievers*. He has his peculiarities. These are not whims. They are not traditionary customs. So far from being eccentricities, they radiate from the proper centre of humanity. He has for each of these a reason. That reason is a Divine reason; it is the reason of God acting in man. In setting

his affections on things above, in preferring the interests which are spiritual and eternal to those which are carnal and transient, in cultivating the desire to benefit others in those respects which he knows to be the most momentous, and in separating himself from the maxims and associations of the age in which he lives, he is acting according to the dictates of truth as they are taught by the authority of the Spirit of Wisdom.

(4.) The believer is conscious of receiving from the Gospel *his encouragements to persevere* in his peculiar course, through all the difficulties which perplex and hinder him. The difficulties which every man has to encounter in his progress through life are as diversified as the characters of individuals: yet they admit of being so classed, that their varieties may be grouped together on some obvious principle of general agreement. The difficulties with which he has to cope who is a vital and practical believer of the Gospel, include, of course, not a few of the difficulties which surround persons of similar temperament, placed in similar circumstances, who are not believers; but, in his case, even these acquire a special character in consequence of the difference which his believing makes between him and others.

Some of the difficulties of the spiritual life have their origin in the imperfection of the believer's mental faculties: the scantiness of his knowledge; the obscurity which rests on objects which he tries to understand; the feebleness, dulness, or incon-

stancy, of his judgment in discriminating things that differ ; or the interference of his imagination, his affections, and his prejudices, with the calm functions of the intellect in apprehending and appreciating truth.

Some difficulties originate in the contradictory opinions which he discovers in the minds of other men ; in the oppositions of speculation ; in the strife of controversy ; in the conflicts of schools and sects ; in the rivalry of competing interests. In proportion as he is modest, candid, well-informed, and devoted to truth, he is afraid, equally of overweening confidence in his private opinion, and of servile adherence, or ignorant and bigoted hostility, to the judgment of men who are, for aught he knows, as sincere, as intelligent, and as free to think according to the natural laws of mind, as he feels himself to be. Knowing as he does that contradictions may both be false, though they cannot both be true ; and seeing, as he does, that, on both sides of disputed questions, there is a large array of knowledge, argument, and moral worth, he finds it difficult to escape from the feebleness of scepticism on the one hand, and, on the other, from the rashness and the falseness of an erroneous positive conclusion.

Not seldom are all the difficulties of a believing mind increased and aggravated by his consciousness of unholy feelings. He is aware of the workings in his own bosom of intellectual and spiritual pride. He is painfully reminded that with

desires which are spiritual other desires are blended which have their excitement and their gratification only in the perishing objects of concupiscence. He has detected in himself an undue estimate of the favourable regards of his fellow-men. He finds his spirit not free from the ambition of ruling and influencing those around him. He has not always been proof against the social fascinations of human life. He cannot assure himself that his mind is perfectly subdued to the mind of God, either in His revelation, or in His government of the world. His devoutness is not always pure, calm, and heavenly. In all these particulars—which act in a way not unlike the disturbing forces that enter into the complicated calculations of astronomy—the self-examining believer learns that the path of his mind around the centre of truth and goodness is so far from being continuous in the right direction, that he has fears lest it should be often, if not always, altogether wrong.

There are difficulties in the spiritual life, as we regard it, which are not fully explained by any of the causes which have now been stated. Both thoughts and feelings which run counter to their natural or their ordinary associations, and to their cherished principles, have been felt by holy men, of which—to say the least—the solutions offered by philosophy have not given us entire satisfaction. Such states of mind may, possibly, arise from undetected causes in the mind itself. There may be unhealthy action. That unhealthy action

may be occasioned by disordered bodily functions ; it may be the result of a perverse mental association ; or it may be the natural consequence of a latent moral evil. But, unless it could be proved that man is the only fallen spirit in creation, there may be added to all these the malignant temptation of an unseen enemy. However it is to be accounted for, the consciousness of believers attests the fact, though the explanation of it is beyond their reach.

Notwithstanding all these difficulties, the believing man is encouraged to persevere, without yielding, or fainting, in his spiritual course : and his primary encouragement he draws from the teaching of the Spirit in the Gospel. There he finds a promise of supernatural aid, expressed in terms so general and comprehensive as to include all the perplexing variations of his inward life, and breathing so hearty an interest in his well-being, such a continued presence and sympathy with him in his struggles, such an earnest assurance of final conquest, as to animate his faith, and invigorate his constancy. His encouragement is consciously derived from the words of promise. The promise itself relates to more than words : it is fulfilled in the actual impartation of that divine strength of which we can know no more than that it is promised, and that it becomes a matter of consciousness in its effects.

This large and full promise of divine grace is, many times, presented in such specific forms, and in such close connection with the spiritual history of

particular persons, that the believer can have no hesitation in applying it to himself, whenever his own experience is similar to that of ancient saints, who "obtained promises" by faith.* Thus it is that the Gospel becomes to the practical believer a perpetual cordial. To him it is like the flashing of the Urim from the gem of Aaron's breastplate; or as the voice that spake in Eden, on Sinai, or at the mount of transfiguration. It tells him not to fear, but to be of good courage. It shows him that Almighty grace is nigh. It whispers hope in the deepest chamber of his soul. Whatever consolation may come to him from the memory of "secret refreshings" in former times; from the trusty records that embalm the memories of saints departed; or from the devout breathings to which poetry has consecrated her divinest lays, and music her sweetest notes; it is to "the Holy Ghost the Comforter" that all these auxiliaries direct his faith: and it is from the words of Him who speaks to us by prophets and apostles, that he takes heart and goes onward in his rough and steep ascent to rest.

(5.) In the same Gospel the believer is conscious of finding the checks that are needful for that discipline by which his heart is to be purified from the dross of error and sin, and by which the spiritual life is to gain strength within him.

* Some of these Promises will be found in the Appendix to this volume, Note M.

The law of Christ, given with a perfect knowledge of "what is in man," and expressing as much love as the gentlest words he ever uttered, is a law which cannot be repealed, and a law from which a believer of the Gospel cannot, as a believer, desire to be exempt. "Then said Jesus to his disciples, If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me."* Here is a law that demands the abandonment of every opinion that opposes the truth which Jesus teaches by His Spirit; the entire renunciation of a man's own obedience to any law of God as his reason for hoping that he will be accepted by Him; the giving up of all reliance on one's own strength in the pursuit of Christian holiness; and the sacrifice of every gratification which is not found on that path on which our great Exemplar walked. To believe the Gospel is to come under this law. To observe this law is to give substantial proof that the Gospel is believed. In the spirit of this holy requirement the apostles exhort and teach their disciples.

In such admonitions the believer knows the voice of the Spirit. Listening to Him, he looks within, and around, with a continual sense of danger. His loneliest moments are not without their peculiar peril. Be he where he may, whatever his natural temper, whatever his associations with other men in the world, he remembers that his worst enemy

* Matt. xvi. 24.

is within; the whole Gospel is continually saying to him, "*keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life.*"*

(6.) From the Gospel the believer is conscious that he learns to pray. There he has been taught that prayer is not a form, but the outpouring of the heart's desires to God. Raising these desires above the grossness of earth to the favour of God, the purification of his thoughts and affections, and his fitness for immortal felicity, the Gospel has revealed to him the Great Propitiation, and the intercession of the one High Priest, as His only and sufficient plea. It has encouraged him to approach "the throne of grace" with calmness and hope, with humility and fearless confidence, even as a son may speak unto his father. It has given him to know that at all times, and from every place, his prayer may pass within the veil. It assures him that he is heard; and, as he believes, he reads the answer in the word of God.

(7.) The believer is conscious of deriving from the Gospel his spiritual peace, his sense of present safety, and his assurance of future blessedness. Whatever interruption he may suffer from the weakness of his mental perceptions, and the many infirmities of heart and inconsistencies of character that cleave to him, he finds that so long as his regards are turned from himself to the work of the Saviour and the promises of grace, his appre-

* Prov. iv. 23.

hensions are allayed; his doubts vanish; "the peace of God which passeth all understanding, keeps his heart and mind through Christ Jesus;" and his prospect of the life to come is serene and comforting.

(8.) The believer of the Gospel, as he imbibes its holy lessons, is conscious of finding scope for his purest social yearnings in the Church. The spiritual household has its united consciousness. A real inward sympathy responds to the "new commandment, that ye love one another."*

Many of the evils flowing from the imperfection of humanity are, unhappily, increased by the unnatural position in which Christians are mutually placed, from undue attachment to the opinions or forms wherein their education or their circumstances have made them differ, and from too faint a remembrance that their bond of union is spiritual rather than intellectual, more in heartiness of sentiment than in verbal formularies or outward usages. But these evils have their remedy in the simplicity with which each believer of the Gospel is warranted by the Gospel to draw his own religious views, and to leave his brethren to draw theirs, fresh from the fount of inspiration.

(9.) The believer is conscious that, as he perseveres in his faith, his prayer, his hope, and his love, these spiritual habitudes gain strength. His early difficulties give way before the practical

* John xiii. 34.

energy of an earnest mind; and the efforts which were at one time needed become concentrated in a power that gives to his highest principles, and to his holiest aspirations, the vigour and steadiness of law. It is of the nature of mind that it should be so. His personal consciousness is as really a part of the divine constitution of things as any of the ascertained arrangements which display the laws of material nature. He "grows in grace," and he also grows in "the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." "The grace" is not without "the knowledge," nor is the knowledge without the grace: the harmony of the one with the other may perplex the speculative; but they do work, and work together, in the experience of the practical believer of the Gospel.

(10.) The spiritual believer may, or he may not, be careful to discriminate the working of his own mind from the working of the Spirit. Whether he is or not, he makes no progress in that kind of inquiry by attending only to his direct consciousness. His own dispositions, thoughts, affections, and purposes are all of which he can be conscious. If he argues on the subject, the testimony of his consciousness can be but one element in the reasoning; the other he must gather from without. From what he knows of his spiritual history—as a whole—compared with what he has good grounds for taking to be the true spiritual history of others, he will not rationally conclude that the new life within him is merely the develop-

ment of what he was before that life began. Neither will he rationally conclude, from the same facts, that he has been entirely passive, that his spirituality has had nothing to do with the activity of his mental nature. The Gospel appeals to his knowledge of what he thinks, desires, and chooses; but it also reveals to him that which, apart from its revelations, he could not know,—namely, that “it is God which worketh in him both to will and to do of His good pleasure.”*

SECONDLY. We may now examine the testimony of the Spirit, in the Scriptures, to this portion of a believer’s personal consciousness. The testimony of Scripture on the general subject has been presented in the second and third Lectures. We now refer, particularly, to those declarations which bear upon the consciousness of the spiritual life in such a way as to account for its being as it is.

(1.) The Scriptures expressly show that the religion which is required and promoted by the Gospel is an inward, spiritual, and active life. The believer is described as one who “hath passed from death unto life,” who “hath life,” “justification of life,” the “light of life,” and the “life of God;” “Christ living in him;” to whom “to live is Christ,” and “Christ is life;” whose “life is hid with Christ in God;” and whose portion is “life and peace.”†

* Phil. ii. 13.

† John v. 24; 1 John v. 12; Rom. v. 18; John viii. 12; Gal. ii. 19, 20; Eph. iv. 18; Phil. i. 21; Col. iii. 3, 4.

(2.) The Scriptures expressly affirm that this inward, spiritual, and active life has its cause, its beginning, in some distinct act of God. The passages containing such affirmations are, on the one hand, those in which God is said to have “begun a good work,” by “the working of His mighty power,” making each of them “a new creature,” “quicken them,” “working in them,” “of his own will begetting them;” and, on the other hand, those in which they are said to be “born again,” “converted,” “called,” “saved,” “made holy.”*

(3.) This causation, or beginning, of life from God is set forth in Scripture as a manifestation of His grace, or His special and undeserved favour towards as many as become conscious of this life. They are “the called according to His purpose;” “beloved of God, called to be holy persons;”—“a chosen generation;”—“a peculiar (appropriated) people;”—“called by His grace;”—being what they are “by the grace of God.” †

(4.) According to the Scriptures, spiritual life in man is wrought by the Spirit of God. “Take not thy Holy Spirit from me.”—“That which is born of the Spirit is spirit.”—“I will put my Spirit within you.”—“The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death.”—“If any man have not the

* Phil. i. 6; Eph. i. 19; 2 Cor. v. 17; Phil. ii. 13; James i. 18; John iii. 3; Acts iii. 19; Rom. i. 7; Eph. ii. 5—8.

† Rom. viii. 28; i. 7; 1 Pet. ii. 9; Tit. ii. 14; Gal. i. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 10.

Spirit of Christ, he is none of His.”—“The Spirit is life.” *

(5.) The life which the Spirit of God graciously begins in man has a relation to Christ the Son of God which is peculiar, spiritual, and indissoluble. Jesus Christ is “the life” of the universe. He has given to the human race at large the promise of “eternal life to every one that believeth on Him.” At the same time, every one that “believeth in Him” is related to Him in a way in which “he that believeth not” is not related to Him.

What that relation is—what it imports when fully understood—can be learned only from the inspired teachers. By them it is brought forward prominently. We find it sublimely intimated in those discourses and prayers of our Lord which bear most directly on the essentials of the spiritual life. The apostles currently allude to this relation, both in their doctrinal instructions and in their practical exhortations, in such a way as to show that to their minds, so wondrously enlightened by the Spirit whom their Lord had promised to give them, this peculiar relation between Christ and believers was always present; and in such a way, too, as to convince us that we cannot understand what they say in such passages, without much of that habit of meditation which is accompanied and strengthened by prayer.

1. This relation is sometimes expressed in the most brief and simple language: “Abide in me,

* Ps. li. 11; John iii. 6; Ezek. xxxvi. 27; Rom. viii. 9, 10.

and I in you.”—“Christ in you the hope of glory.”
 “Them that are in Christ Jesus.”—“We are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ.”—
 “Christ liveth in me.”—“As the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same.”—“We are made partakers of Christ.”* The love of Christ to believers is reciprocated by the love of believers to Him. “He that is joined unto the Lord is one Spirit.”

2. This relation is illustrated by partial resemblances in the natural or social relations with which men are familiar.

(a.) Jesus speaks of it in that remarkable discourse in which he compares himself to the manna with which the tribes of Israel were fed in the desert. “I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.”—“Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you.”†

(b.) The same close relation is compared also by Jesus to that of the vine and the branches. “I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without (apart from) me ye can do

* John xv. 4; Col. i. 27; Rom. viii. 1; 1 John v. 20; Gal. ii. 20; Heb. ii. 14; iii. 14.

† John vi. 51—53.

nothing.”* Alluding to this mode of illustration, the apostle Paul describes the “newness of life,” in which believers are to walk; and as our being “planted together in the likeness of His death, and of His resurrection.”†

(c.) One of the apostles illustrates the peculiar relation between Christ and His church, by that of the head and the several members of the body: that “speaking the truth in love, ye may grow up unto Him which is the head, even Christ;”—“from which all the body, by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.”‡

(d.) The same relation is compared to that of a husband and his wife:—“The husband is the head of the wife; even as Christ is the head of the church”.—“We are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones; . . . This is a great mystery, but I speak concerning Christ and His church.”§

(e.) This relation is referred to by our Lord as shadowing forth, in some respect, the ineffable relation between the Father and Himself. “As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you. If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love—even as I have kept my Father’s commandments, and abide in His love.”—“Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall

* John xv. 5.

† Eph. iv. 15; Col. ii. 19.

‡ Rom. vi. 5.

§ Eph. v. 23—32.

believe in me through their word; that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee." *

These analogies are not fanciful but real. Though real, they are only partial. Each of them bears on some aspect of the relation of Christ to His church. Each is designed to impart a distinct conception of the fact—that there is such a relation; to enable us to apprehend that it is peculiar; to show us that it is spiritual; and to assure us that it is never to be dissolved. There is a high and sacred sense in which it may be affirmed that the relation of Christ as a Saviour to each member of his church as a believer, is a relation wholly natural: that is to say, it is as truly of the nature of a Saviour, and of the nature of a believer in that Saviour, that they should be so related in the matter of salvation, as it is of the nature of food to nourish the animal life—of a vine to sustain its branches—of a head to guide the body—and of a husband to “be joined to his wife.”†

Our consciousness has to do with only *one side* of this relation, namely, our relation to Christ. Our belief that so it is—with all the affections which flow from believing that it is so—will more than warrant the strength and warmth of our devotional interest in one to whom we are so closely related. But this relation has *another side*, namely—Christ’s relation to us. This is not known by us otherwise than through the revelation which we believe. A

* John xv. 10; xvii. 20, 21.

† Eph. v. 31.

principal object of that relation, and therefore, of our believing, is the work undertaken by the Son of God, and by Him accomplished in our flesh.

There is a large number of passages in the New Testament which show the Gospel, the Saviour, the "grace" or "love" manifest through the Saviour, and made known in the Gospel, in their aspect towards all mankind indiscriminately. The "tidings" are "for all people,"—that "all men through Him might believe." "I will draw all men to me." "God will have all men to be saved, and is not willing that any should perish." "Christ gave Himself a ransom for all." "He is the Saviour of all men"—"the Saviour of the world;" "the light of the world," "the life of the world."—"The grace which bringeth salvation hath appeared unto all men."—Jesus tasted "death for every man,"—"died for all,"—as "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world."—"God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself;"—Christ "is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world;"—"God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son."*

It is not maintained by any class of expositors that these passages assure any man of salvation without believing, repenting, and becoming spiritually "alive unto God."† Neither has any class of

* Luke ii. 10; John i. 7, 29; iii. 14—16; xii. 32; Rom. v. 10; 1 Cor. xv. 22; 2 Cor. v. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 4; iv. 10; Titus ii. 11, 12; Heb. ii. 9; 2 Pet. iii. 9.

† Rom. vi. 11.

expositors gone into the opposite extreme of affirming, in the face of such passages, that any man is forbidden to believe, repent, and live to God; or that any man who believes, and repents, will, *for any reason whatever*, be excluded from salvation; for such a man's being what he is here supposed to be, is *itself* a proof that he is, already, saved. We must therefore conclude that, avoiding both of the extremes which are possible, we are warranted by the Gospel to call on every man to believe; and to promise every man in the name of God, that, as a believer, he may be saved. In this same New Testament we meet with a further number of passages which show the Gospel, the Saviour, the "grace" or "love" of God, in their aspect towards that portion of mankind which includes all, and none but, the finally saved. These are "the redeemed from among men;"—"the peculiar people;"—"the church;"—"the beloved;"—"the separated;"—"the spiritual;"—those that are "born of God;"—"the children of God;"—"the flock of Christ;"—"many sons brought to glory;"—those that were "given to Christ."*

No class of expositors has imagined that the persons who are thus described are—all mankind: it is universally acknowledged that these latter descriptions apply only to the believing, the holy, the saved. There is no confusion in these representations. Neither is there any contradiction of

* Rev. xiv. 3, 4; Titus ii. 14; Rom. viii. 31, 33; John x. 15, 29; xi. 52; xvii. 2, 6, 9, 11, 12, 24; Eph. v. 25.

the one to the other. They are concentric circles. Other circles, more than we can comprehend, have similar, though more distant, relations to the same divine centre; we have at least a glance of some segments of them in sundry parts of the Scriptures which tell of "spiritual creatures" who are not men; and likewise, in other portions, we trace the connection even of things which are not spiritual with those which are, and especially with God, whose glorious attributes the whole creation is intended to display. But we confine our thoughts, at present, to the relation between the Saviour and ourselves as shown in the passages of Scripture which are before us. In the former passages which we have cited, we see the aspect of the Gospel towards all human sinners as needing to be saved, and welcome to salvation in the way revealed; in the latter passages we see the aspect of the Gospel towards as many sinners of our race as are, or shall be, saved. Now it is of these latter that we have been speaking—of their consciousness. It is *their* special relation to Christ that we have just been considering.—We proceed to view this relation on its other side, so that we may learn from the New Testament how Christ is related to "His people."

3. Christ is so related to His people that what He does in that relation is *substantially* the same as if it were done personally by them. We are not strangers, either as citizens, or as Christians, to representative systems. There is nothing to shock our reason, or to contradict our experience, in the

principle of one becoming, in some sort, a substitute for another. Now the relation which Christ bears to His redeemed church is so manifestly of this character, that men must altogether overlook the place filled by the Mediator in the writings of the New Testament, or they must substitute “another Gospel” for that which the apostles preached, before they can imagine a Christianity without “Christ crucified” as the life of believing offenders, in their penitent return to God. Taking the plain, glowing, and constantly reiterated affirmations of our inspired teachers, in their addresses to intelligent and spiritual converts, as meaning what philology, argument, and the practical history of our religion, concur in proving that they meant—a real and proper substitution of Jesus Christ for those who are redeemed by His life and death, we can scarcely approach with the cautiousness of enquiry a theme so sacred, and so touching in its association with our deepest emotions, and our dearest interests. We read that “He loved us and gave Himself for us;”—“died in our stead;”—“suffered the just instead of the unjust;” that He “hath borne our griefs;” that “He, who knew no sin, was made sin for us”—“made a curse for us;” that “He rose for our justification;”—“by Himself purged our sins:”—was “made like unto His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful high priest, in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people;” that He “became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him;” that

“within the veil” “the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus;” that “by His own blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us;” that by “one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified;” that He is “the author and finisher of our faith, who, for the joy that was set before Him, endured the cross, despising the shame;” that we “are of God in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption;”—and that we are “made the righteousness of God in Him.”*

What can we be taught by such clear words as these, if they do not teach us that, although analogies may partially illustrate *our* relation to Christ, and the things which one man can do for another may dimly shadow forth what Christ has done for us, yet *His relation* to us is not one which can find its parallel in any other: for it transcends them all, and “passeth knowledge.” As we meditate devoutly—it were profanity to approach in any other frame the transactions of His amazing and attractive history—we behold in His birth, ours; in His rising, ours; in His ascension, ours; in His glory, ours. In like manner we are warranted to think of Christ as viewing “His people” with reciprocal regards. When they are “born again,” He “sees of the travail of His soul.” As they die to

* Eph. v. 2; 1 Pet. iii. 18; Isa. liii. 4; Rom. iv. 25; Heb. i. 3; ii. 17; v. 9; vi. 20; ix. 12; x. 14; xii. 2; 1st Cor. i. 30; 2 Cor. v. 21.

sin, He makes them know "the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable to his death." In the struggles of their faith with old prejudices and false reliances, He beholds them "crucified together with Him." Under trials of hope and patience, He is "touched with the feeling of their infirmity." It will be His "joy" to "present them faultless before His Father." Through every scene He appears to be claiming us as His, that He may embolden us to claim Him as ours. Behold "the riches of the glory of this mystery," "Christ in us," that we may be presented "perfect in Him." He is the fountain and the ocean of our spiritual life: its very heart. He lives in us: and so we live in Him.*

4. Christ is so related to those whose "life" which they "now live in the flesh" they "live by the faith of the Son of God," that what is done towards them is done towards Him. Are they "quickened?" It is "together with Him." Are they forgiven? It is "for Christ's sake." Are they approved? It is "in Christ." Are they accepted? It is "in the Beloved." Are their prayers heard? They offer them "in His name." Are they made to "sit together in heavenly places?" It is "in Christ Jesus." If "one of the least of His brethren" is ministered unto in sickness, or in prison, in hunger, thirst, or nakedness, He will say to those who did it, "Ye have

* Matt. i. 21; 1 Pet. i. 23; Isa. liii. 11; Phil. iii. 10; Gal. v. 24; Heb. iv. 15; Jude 24; Col. i. 27, 28.

done it unto me.” To his martyred servant, Stephen, he appears in the opened heavens “standing at the right hand of God.” To Saul, persecuting those who “called on His name,” he says, “Why persecutest thou ME?” The Spirit is sent in His name—given by Him, that they to whom He is given may be conformed to His likeness, and that He may be “the First-born among many brethren.” As the heart’s core of spiritual humanity, He vibrates at every touch that benefits or injures them. His love to them is quick, jealous. No property is so carefully hoarded as His interest in them. They are His crown; nor will He suffer one leaf to fade, or one gem to lose its lustre: for He is to be “glorified in His saints, and admired in all them that believe.” As “in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily”—as “God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him,” and as “the Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into His hand,” giving Him “power over all flesh, that He should give eternal life to as many as Thou hast given Him,” so “He baptizeth them with the Holy Ghost,” fills them “with all the fulness of God,” that they may be “full of the Holy Ghost”—“filled with the Spirit”—“sanctified and made meet, and prepared for the Master’s use”—“made meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light.” The main reason why the Spirit is given to men is expressed by Christ himself in His gracious promise to His disciples: “He shall testify of ME; He

shall glorify ME : for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you." "All things that the Father hath are mine : therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you."*

Christianity is this manifestation of Christ in His people. Men become Christians by having the Spirit of Christ in them. They know themselves to be Christians, as they are conscious of being like Christ. They prove that they are Christians by living as Christ lived. "As He was, so are we in this world."†

5. The relation between Christ and His people is contrasted, in the New Testament, with the parallel relation between Adam and his posterity. This contrast is briefly touched, at one point, in the Apostle Paul's argument on the resurrection, in his first epistle to the Corinthians. "For since by (a) man (came) death, by (a) man (came) also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. The first man Adam was made a living soul : the last Adam (was made) a quickening spirit—the first man is of the earth, earthy ; the second man is the Lord from heaven."

The same contrast is carried out to greater length in the epistle to the Romans.‡

* Gal. ii. 20 ; Col. ii. 13 ; Eph. iv. 32 ; Rom. xvi. 10 ; Eph. i. 16 ; ii. 6 ; Matt. xxv. 40 ; Acts vii. 56 ; ix. 4 ; Rom. viii. 29 ; 2 Thess. i. 10 ; Col. ii. 9 ; John iii. 34 ; xvii. 2 ; i. 33 ; Eph. iii. 19 ; Acts xi. 24 ; Eph. v. 18 ; 2 Tim. ii. 21 ; Col. i. 12 ; John xv. 26 ; xvi. 14, 15.

† 1 John iv. 17.

‡ Rom. v. 15—19.

The *analogy* assumed in these passages is between the relation of Adam to his seed, and the relation of Christ to His seed: in this respect Adam was a "type of Him that was to come:"—Adam the first man: Christ the second Adam. The *contrast* of these analogous relations lies between the Divine principles which they display, and between the persons,—their several seeds,—and the opposite effects which result from their respective modes of acting. Adam was "of the earth;" Jesus is "the Lord from heaven." Adam's relation to his posterity was a display of Divine righteousness; Christ's relation to His people is a manifestation of Divine grace. Adam stood in a special relation to his natural posterity; Christ stands in a special relation to His redeemed people. Adam, in his relation to his posterity, transgressed; Christ, in His relation to His people, was obedient. By Adam's offence his race has been condemned; by Christ's obedience, His people are justified. Adam's disobedience brought his children to the grave; Christ's obedience brings to His people a glorious resurrection, and an everlasting life.

6. The things which relate to our spiritual life are revealed to us in the Gospel that, by believing what it reveals, we may apprehend and enjoy them.

As consciousness is the only source of our knowledge of the human, revelation is the only source of our knowledge of the Divine. We know nothing of the Holy Spirit but what He has communicated

to us by His inspired servants. The things revealed to us by Him through them are the things which relate to our spiritual life. The facts and the principles or truths thus made known are not intended either to excite or to gratify our speculative curiosity. They are “our life,”—“words whereby we shall be saved.” These words are to be understood—not in all their possible bearings, but in their one bearing on our personal salvation. They are to be believed, held as true to us. He who holds them as true to him, cannot act as though these true things were not known by him, or as though they were not held by him as true. By believing the truth, he comes to think truly, to feel truly, and to act truly, according to the Divine model. Men can no more contravene the laws of their spiritual nature, than they can contravene the laws of their material nature. To be “spiritually minded,” is to “mind the *things of the Spirit* ;” and this is “life and peace.” To “mind the things of the Spirit,” is to believe them, intelligently, earnestly, habitually, and practically, even as the mariner minds his chart, his compass, his sextant, and the stars of heaven, for the purpose of being guided by them in a course where, without them, no sagacity, no experience, no good intentions or feelings of his own, could enable him to find his way.

So important, so necessary is it to have the truths without believing which we have no spiritual life clearly and vividly presented to us, that every mode

of awaking attention to them has been graciously employed for this purpose. With what a variety and fulness of gifts have “men of God” been enriched, that they might be fitted for so high a service ! What a perpetual miracle is that collection of Holy Writings which by the common consent of Christendom is called The Book !*

* “The connexion in which a book may stand to the intellectual and spiritual life of men,” has been shown with great originality and beauty, in the Hulsean Lectures for 1845 and 1846. By Richard Chevenix Trench, M.A., Professor of Divinity, King’s College, London. Second edition, Cambridge. “It is only by recurrence to such witnesses as are thus secured for the form in which the truth was at first delivered, that any great restoration or reformation can proceed ; only so, can that which is grown old renew its youth, and cast off the slough of age. Without this, all that is once let go would be irrecoverably gone ; all once lost, would be lost for ever. Without this, all that did not interest at the moment, all which was laid deep for the uses of a remote posterity, of which they were first to discover the price and the value, would, long before it reached them, have inevitably perished. And when the church of the apostolic age, with that directly following, is pointed to as an exception to this general rule—as a church existing without a Scripture,—even as, no doubt, for some while, the church did exist with a canon not full formed, but forming, and for a little while, without any Scriptures peculiarly its own, it is left out of sight that the question is not, whether a church could so *exist*—but whether it could *subsist*—not whether it could be, but whether it could *continue* to be. That for a while, under rare combinations of favourable circumstances, with living witnesses, and fresh memories of the Lord’s life and death in the midst of it, a Christian church, without any actual writings of its New Covenant, could have existed, is one thing ; and another, whether it could so have survived through long ages ; whether without them it could have kept ever before its eyes any clear and distinct image of Him that was its Founder, or stamped

According to the teaching of The Book, the truths which it contains are to be preached by believing, holy, and loving men; and all such men are to regard it as one of the great aims of their lives to adorn these truths in their own character, and to spread them far and wide, until they have reached every mind on earth. We know of no conversions, in the scriptural meaning of the word, which have been effected otherwise than by believing the truths revealed by the Spirit in the Scriptures. Neither do we know of any mind believing these truths, apart from the signs of a spiritual life. Our Lord has said—"The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." Of the apostles' ministry it is narrated—"Now, when they heard Peter's preaching, they were pricked in their hearts;"—"they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them three thousand souls;"—"all that believed were together;" he "shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved;"—the Lord "opened Lydia's heart, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul." In the epistles of the New Testament it is affirmed that the "Gospel of Christ is the power of God unto

any lively impress of Him on the hearts of its children. No; it is assuredly no happy accident of the church that it possesses a Scripture; but, if the wonder of the church's first becoming were not to repeat themselves continually—if it was at all to know a natural evolution in the world; then, as far as we can see, this was a necessary condition of its very subsistence."

salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek; for therein is the righteousness of God revealed;”—that they who had been “the servants of sin,” “obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered to them;” and that “it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.” The apostle Paul says to the Corinthian believers: “Though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers: for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the Gospel.” And in his epistle to Philemon, he says of Onesimus,—“whom I have begotten in my bonds.” To the Thessalonians the same apostle says,—“when ye received the word of God, which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe.” In the epistle to the Hebrews we read,—“the word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart.” The apostle James declares to the twelve tribes scattered abroad,—“of His own will begat He us with the word of truth;” and he speaks of “the engrafted word which is able to save your souls.” The apostle Peter says “to the strangers scattered,” “seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth, through the Spirit, unto unfeigned love of the brethren, love one

another with a pure heart fervently: being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever.” *

A critical examination of the words in each of these passages appears to warrant the conclusion—that by the preaching of the Gospel, men are brought to know the truth, to believe it, and to bring forth its fruit, in a holy, spiritual life.

We have thus sought to bring closely together the whole of what is taught in the New Testament respecting that spiritual life of which Christians are conscious. We have seen that this spiritual life is the peculiar life of Christians;—that it is from God;—that it is a manifestation of the “grace” or “love” of God;—that it is wrought by the Holy Spirit;—that it has a singular and indissoluble relation to Christ;—and that it is the effectual working of the truth which is revealed in the Gospel. To the extent in which it is possible to compare this teaching of the New Testament with the consciousness of Christians, the one is the exact counterpart of the other. In those respects in which the limits of the human mind forbid our making such a comparison, we believe, on the authority of Him by whom the apostles were inspired, that their testimony in this matter is true. Such is our Christian belief.

* John vi. 63; Acts ii. 41, 44; xi. 14; xvi. 14; Rom. i. 16; vi. 17; 1 Cor. i. 21; iv. 15; 1 Thess. ii. 13; iv. 12; Jas. i. 18, 21; 1 Pet. i. 22, 23.

THIRDLY. We shall now briefly examine some explanations of the spiritual life which have been GIVEN BY THEOLOGIANS. It can scarcely be necessary, though it may be advisable, to introduce our examination by saying that whatever there may be of comparative truth in these explanations of men, we are to distinguish them from the positive truth revealed to us by God. So far as the explanations relate to things which are revealed, they may be of service to us in many ways: they may show the manner in which the truth has been apprehended by various minds; and they may correct our own apprehensions on points respecting which ignorance, erroneous teaching, or too superficial thought, may have led us into mistakes. If we candidly compare them, we may learn to distrust our own judgment in matters wherein wise, holy, and studious Christians have greatly differed from each other. If we give due consideration to the opinion intended to be expressed in the language used for the purpose of expressing it, and to the reasons offered for holding that opinion, we may be convicted of unfairness in having suffered prejudice to pervert our understanding of the sense of terms, our judgment of the truth of propositions, or our perception of the force of arguments. We may be led to the conclusion, that what many have been contending for as divine truth has been no more than a human explanation, possibly an inaccurate explanation, of that truth.—So far as these or other explanations relate to things which are not revealed,

we must regard them as purely speculative. They may be ingenious, interesting, probable, or even demonstrable on some acknowledged principles; still, inasmuch as they relate to what is not revealed by the Spirit of God, we are not permitted to place them on a level with the things which the Spirit has revealed.

1. The first explanation of the Spiritual life which we shall notice is the *traditional explanation*. This is involved in the church notions which have been unfolded in our fourth Lecture. We now object to it—that it originates in an obsolete and erroneous philosophy; that it confounds the material with the Spiritual, the human with the divine; that it is part of a system of sacerdotal pretensions, which is so far from being founded on the New Testament as to be opposed alike to its letter and to its spirit; that its tendency is to prevent spiritual religion by drawing the mind away from God to man. Blinding the intellect, and prostrating the conscience, it substitutes for the humble, heartfelt, and manly, devotion of Christians, the coldness of form, the illusions of fancy, or the morbid fervour of enthusiasm. It exalts the clergy by depressing the church. It covers with a veil the majestic grandeur of our Saviour's mediation. It nurses many hearts in superstition. It deceives and hardens other hearts into infidelity. It nullifies the New Testament, and supersedes the faith of the Gospel. It destroys the true character of the Christian ministry as an office for the instruction

of mankind in the truths which God has revealed. We find its emblem at the forsaken sepulchre, in the linen grave-clothes which the risen Lord has left behind Him.

2. Another explanation of spiritual life is — *enthusiastical*.

The enthusiast regards himself or his teacher as inspired, receiving revelations of truth, and intimations of duty, direct from God: as seeing God; hearing God; feeling God. In nearly every age of the church, professions have been made of private illumination by the Spirit—that supernatural kind of illumination which was given to “men of God,” before the completion of the sacred canon. The extraordinary gifts of the first age were bestowed on the apostles as the witnesses of our Lord’s resurrection, and on those on whom they laid their hands, with prayer for this specific gift. These gifts proved the Divine commission of the apostles; fitted them to declare infallibly the “counsel of God;” and ensured the continuance of their testimony by written oracles until the end of the world.

We find no Divine arrangement mentioned in the New Testament for a constant succession, nor any promise held out of the reappearance, of these extraordinary endowments; on the contrary, there is much to imply that, after the first generation of Christians, they would cease. When pretensions to such illuminations have arisen, they have always failed before the application of the tests which

proved the reality of the apostolic powers. Christians are cautioned by inspired apostles against delusions of that kind. The instruction and comfort of the church have been promoted, for many ages, by the rational and devout application of the truth revealed in Scripture, and believed by Christians. We may add, that doctrines contrary to each other, and manifestly inconsistent with the Scriptures, have been propagated under the guise of spiritual illumination, and that wisdom, piety, humility, and reverence for the Holy Spirit, unite in urging us to reject them altogether. Far, very far indeed, are we from denying that the reader or hearer of the Gospel will understand it better in proportion as he prays to be enlightened by the Spirit. But the most enlightened believer cannot impart his views to others on his personal authority as one who is peculiarly instructed; he can commend those views to others only by appropriate reasons. It is not the *fact* of his illumination, but the *fruits* it produces in his wise and consistent exposition of what the Spirit has revealed in Scripture, that affords a satisfactory and spiritual ground of agreement with him. Where that ground is not offered, his private illumination, how real soever, and beyond all price to him, invests him with no power to command the acquiescence of a single mind. The unquestionably good effects ascribed by enthusiasts to the direct illumination of the Spirit are either such as are really due to the suggestions of natural reason and conscience, or

such as ordinarily follow from the practical belief of revealed truth.

3. The last explanation we notice may be called the *philosophical*.

The most active efforts of the human intellect have been directed, for a long time, to the study of the laws of nature. These studies have been successful to a remarkable extent. Many supposed occult powers have been exploded. By the knowledge of mechanical forces, of chemical affinities, of electric and molecular attractions and repulsions, of the structure of animal tissues, and of the analyses of nutritive and vital processes, many confused notions, and not a little unmeaning phraseology, have been rendered obsolete. The advantages thus gained for physical science, for practical life, and for natural theology, are such as none but the ignorant would for a moment depreciate.—It scarcely seemed presumptuous to hope that methods of inquiry which had solved so many difficulties might suffice for the solution of many more. That which is known invariably to precede a given fact in the operations of nature, is presumed to be its cause. From this presumption,—which is only a *part* of the truth,—it is promptly inferred that, in the operations of man's spiritual life, the cause of every movement is, in like manner, that which is known immediately to precede it. Yet prompt and seemingly philosophical as this inference may be, it begins with the fallacy of assuming that spi-

ritual actions resemble physical phenomena: overlooking the testimony of consciousness to the truth that between these two things thus comprehended in one class—the physical and the spiritual—there is no likeness at all. Besides assuming this, the speculator takes for granted that he is familiar with all the conditions both of natural causes and of spiritual life. But we do not know that philosophy has accounted for the beginning of anything in the multiform series of complex natural causes with which science deals: there is always some agency, power, principle, or law, which still remains to be explained. As to our spiritual nature, philosophers of no mean name in ancient Greece, and in modern England, Germany, and France, have lost their way by going beyond the range of consciousness into metaphysical abstractions, or by mistaking the analysis of notions, and the dissection of terms, for the exposition of facts. Whatever classification of mental states may be adopted, and by whatever names it may be thought expedient to call such mental states, the true philosophy of the human mind consists only in a correct induction of the facts of consciousness, and in an exposition of the laws according to which these facts are known to be developed. The peculiarity of those mental acts with which Christianity is more specially concerned lies in their spontaneity, in the responsibility of him who performs these acts, and in the condemned and unhappy state of those who, of their own accord,

have sinned. It is with men so regarded that Christianity has to do. It is to their case that the explanation we are considering is to be applied. The explanation is this:—that the reception of truth by the mind is the cause of whatever change is known to follow that reception of the truth, in the same way in which an effect in material nature is accounted for. In whatever sense it is understood that the truth received by sinful men is revealed by the Spirit, in that sense the explanation admits that the Spirit is the cause of the change; but the means, or proximate cause, is held to be—*the truth received into the mind*.—In support of this theory it has been ably argued that such terms as conversion, repentance, regeneration, sanctification, mean nothing else than the effects produced by believing the truths which God has revealed; that there is no conceivable principle of religion, but a fixed mode of thinking on religious subjects; that the moral depravity of man can be rectified only by such moral means as those which are supplied in the truths and motives of the Gospel; that nothing in religion can be a matter of personal consciousness, which is not the effect of truth believed; that faith is the principle of holy action; that this view is analogous to all the other operations of Divine agency in nature and in providence; that the representations of inspired writers agree with the experience of men in showing that the effects attributed to the Spirit are produced by the truth; and that the re-

jection of this view involves a notion of physical impulses, which is contrary alike to the moral constitution of man, and to the genius of true religion.*

Some of these considerations, partial and one-sided though they be, commend themselves as having no small force *against the mysticism which expects men to be saved without believing the Gospel.*

In the second Lecture, we have proved that the Spirit is the permanent Teacher of Divine truth; and in the third Lecture we have proved that the Spirit also does that which is not teaching, but which results in a man heartily receiving the truth, and bringing forth the fruits of faith. In the present Lecture it has been our aim to evince the harmony of consciousness with revelation in both these views of the Spirit's work—saving men. The explanation now under review, according to our best judgment, often and anxiously revised, appears to be *defective*. We are not satisfied with being told that by conversion, repentance, regeneration, sanctification, and the strong figurative language used in illustration of them, nothing more is meant than the effects produced by believing the Gospel. They do indeed describe the effects produced by believing the Gospel; yet, as it appears to us, they describe further, *that*—we presume not to define it—without the doing of which the Gospel is not so

* Bennett's Gospel Dispensation.—Glasgow Correspondence.

believed as to produce these effects; and this is what we understand to be meant by the large class of passages in the New Testament in which the saving work of the Spirit is promised, prayed for, or described, as characterising the spiritual history of redeemed sinners.

Is any work wrought in a sinner by the Spirit of God in order to that humble reception of the truth which we agree in speaking of as faith? As we understand the explanation we are examining, it answers—No. Our own answer to the question is—Yes. To us the Scriptures seem to yield this answer. Far as we are from supposing that the work which we consider as pervading all that is understood, in ordinary language, as the beginning and the progress of spiritual life, is one of which a man can be directly conscious, we are equally far from believing that human consciousness alone is to be consulted in the matter, or that the lack of consciousness is to be supplied by even the soberest speculations on the possible and the necessary; for our religious faith is founded neither on the facts of consciousness, nor on the demonstrations of reason, but simply on the word of God which is contained in Holy Scripture. As we turn away from ecclesiastical assumptions, and from the coloured clouds of mysticism, so also do we rise above the clearest lights of philosophy to the authoritative teachings of the Holy Spirit, respecting His own work in saving us.

It may be asked, with all propriety—since you

reject the explanations of tradition, of enthusiasm, and of philosophy,—what better explanation do you propose? In all seriousness and good faith, it is replied:—We have no explanation which we could propose with confidence, as solving the entire problem of that spiritual life which is the consciousness of a Christian, and which the Holy Spirit claims in the New Testament, as His peculiar work in all them that are saved; nor do we know of any human explanation to which we could subscribe. But why have *any*? Can we unfold what is spoken of in Scripture as a mystery? Who has explained the life of a plant—of an animal—of a mind? We firmly hold all that has been said, by whomsoever, of the indispensable connection of the believing of the Gospel, with salvation,—of the efficacious working of the Gospel in them that believe,—of the freedom of man from all outward constraint or impulse in believing the Gospel, and in living as he does, because he believes it. And we hold, not more nor less firmly, all that has been said, by whomsoever, of the indisputable connection of believing “to the saving of the soul” with being “born again,” with “having the Spirit,” with being “made partakers of the Divine nature,” with being “in Christ,” with being “chosen of God.” These are “things which are surely believed” by us. We have no hope of converting men, guiding them in action, or comforting them in sorrow and in death, if they will not believe the Gospel. Neither do we expect any man to believe the Gospel—as we are

persuaded he could, if he would, and as we are sure he ought—until he is born of “the Spirit.” But when we are required to believe that the Spirit of God does something to the truth after it is revealed, which neither adds to its quantity, nor changes its quality, we confess that we are puzzled. We find no relief from our perplexity in being told that the truth has some new or additional power when the Spirit wields it as a man might wield a “hammer” or a “sword;” for we cannot discover the appropriateness of the sacred imagery, when so applied. There is a coarseness, as well as a want of accuracy, in such applications, which revolts the taste which we have cultivated, however imperfectly, by the study of the prophets and apostles.—It may seem superficial to avoid *explaining* how it is that the spiritual life of man is produced and sustained by the Spirit of God, and at the same time connected with man’s own believing of the truth. Be it so. A full explanation of this whole matter has not yet been given, so far as we are acquainted with theological literature. We make no pretensions of ability to supply the defect. No words of man have brought out all “the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ,”* neither do any words of man that we have read, bring out all the truth of our Lord’s memorable declaration: “that which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.”†

* Col. ii. 2.

† John iii. 6.

We may not be able to show, to the satisfaction of all men, *how* these things are; but the believer of the Gospel has in himself the witness that they really are as the Gospel, which he believes, has represented them to be.

LECTURE VII.

THE MORAL ENERGY OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE.

“IF YE THROUGH THE SPIRIT DO MORTIFY THE DEEDS OF THE BODY,
YE SHALL LIVE.”—Rom. viii. 13.

WHILE the inspired writers distinctly teach that there is a work of the Spirit in man, they never confound that with the proper work of man himself. It is that man may do his proper work, acting according to the principles of his nature as it comes from God, that the work of the Spirit is wrought in him. So we understand their doctrines and admonitions.

In those parts of the New Testament where the Spirit is most fully and emphatically set forth, the consequence to result from what he does is at the same time most earnestly enjoined. Christians are required to “walk after the Spirit,” to “sow to the Spirit,” to bring forth “the fruit of the Spirit.” They who are “sanctified by the Holy Ghost” are called on to “cleanse themselves from all filthiness of the flesh and the spirit,” and to “perfect holiness in the fear of God.”

It is probable that believers, both among the Jews and among the Greeks, would receive with the same reverence the revealed truth and the Divine exhortation which alike came to them from God, not perplexing themselves with curious questions as to the speculative consistency of the things which they were thus taught. As soon, however, as the notions acquired independently of the Gospel began to tincture men's thoughts, and to modify their language, on the themes of their religious belief, we discover two conflicting intellectual tendencies: the one to fatalism, the other to a rigid assertion of the freedom of man. Along with these intellectual tendencies we perceive the gradual progress of that ecclesiastical encroachment which not only proscribed the right of private judgment on the meaning of the Gospel, but also abridged the liberty of personal action according to the dictates of each man's conscience. The Church became the mistress, as well as the teacher, of the Christian people. So long as there was no vigorous assertion of individual freedom either in thought or in action, and men silently submitted to the doctrines and the rules of the hierarchy, they might enjoy the reputation, with all its real or supposed advantages, of being the obedient children of the church.

It was not likely that this artificial limiting of Christianity would produce such living results as those by which, at the first, the Gospel had proved itself to be the power of God. It was but

natural for those who judged of what is right by proxy to leave the practice as well as the study of spiritual religion to their acknowledged superiors, contenting themselves with an implicit faith in what they were taught to believe, and an outward conformity with the regulations which they were required, as Christians, to observe. While there was scarcely any living faith resulting from personal conviction of the grand truths of the Gospel, and while, at the same time, the principles of natural morality were generally weakened, and even superseded, by the mere habits of obedience to spiritual rulers, it was not to be expected that there could be more than exceptional instances of the high morality which the belief of the Gospel invariably produces.

Such was the condition of affairs in Western Christendom, when Pelagius and his disciples Julian and Coelestius began to propagate the doctrines which oppose the scholastic and ascendent theology, by asserting the moral powers of human nature. It might not be difficult to show that there was much in the state of opinion and of morals at the time to excuse, though it did not fully justify, the stand which was made by the Pelagians. As opposed to the technical scholasticism which prevailed in the high places of the church, and to the loose morality which threatened the destruction of the Christian religion, their aim appears to well-informed persons to have been praiseworthy; and the most candid, of every party,

have confessed that their reasonings from Scripture, and their appeals to conscience, were by no means destitute of force.* But, as usually fares in disputes, one extreme was exchanged for another, not less distant from the truth, and equally fraught with mischiefs, though different in kind. The fallacy of Pelagianism lies in substituting the theory of human nature as it ought to be, for the history of human nature as it is; and, while zealous for morality, in overlooking the truths of the Gospel which, besides embracing objects higher than human morality, constitute the only spring from which a pure morality has ever flowed. In opposing Pelagianism, Augustine may have been greatly influenced by an apprehension of its practical consequences in drawing men away from their attendance on the offices of the church; but we cannot study the writings of that great defender of the orthodox faith, and not perceive that he was also moved by loyalty to Christ, and by zeal on behalf of those doctrines which embody the principles peculiar to Christianity, so largely

* Versuch einer pragmatischen Darstellung des Augustinismus und Pelagianismus nach ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Von Gustav Friedrich Wiggers. 1833. The first volume of Dr. Wiggers' Essay was translated, with an instructive preface, by Mr. R. Emerson, Professor of Church History in the Theological Seminary at Andover, Mass. This translation is now out of print. I have both the volumes of the original, and have derived much advantage from the study of them. In Dr. W.'s candour, impartiality, and vigorous apprehension of principles and arguments, one cannot but rejoice, even though one does not take precisely the same views.

exhibited in the writings of the apostle of the nations.* The re-assertion of these doctrines in their breadth and power was the strength of the Reformation. It was the pith of Puritanism. It has won for their successors in the reformed churches of the Continent, and among the Calvinists of England, Scotland, and America, the honour or the stigma of Evangelicalism. Without refusing this title to those Christians who do not understand, or understanding, do not adopt, the metaphysical doctrines of Calvinism, and without affirming that those metaphysical doctrines are, in all respects, a just representation of the truths concerning Divine grace which are revealed in the New Testament, we know that the followers of Augustine in the ancient times, and of Calvin in the modern times, have been the most distinguished for the maintenance of the power and grace of God in man's salvation.

The moral arguments against these doctrines, whether urged by their earlier or their later opponents, are, we believe, substantially the same with those which are answered in the Epistle to the Romans. We need not shrink from comparing the preaching of these doctrines with that of their opponents, in the moral effects produced by each respectively.

* Dr. Hampden, in his Bampton Lectures, seems to me to be swayed by this theory of the difference between the distinctive tendencies of the Eastern and Western churches. Dr. Neander has fully exhibited the whole matter with his own peculiar ability.

The direct and exclusive preaching of morality has been tried in this country, along with such Christian doctrines as were suggested by the grand festivals of the church, aided by the advantages of learning, capacity, and every kind of social respectability; and the fruit has been seen, long since, in the almost total banishment of religion and morality from the habits of the English people; while, on the contrary, the lively exhibition of the truths which are essential, as well as peculiar, to Christianity, whether with or without the metaphysical points on which evangelical believers are divided, has been uniformly followed by the turning of the sinner from the evil of his ways, and the steady practice of the virtues by which man is dignified, and society adorned.

This practical development of the spiritual life exhibits the manifestation of the Spirit of God in the restoration of man to the Divine image. Whatever mystery belongs to the mode of the Spirit's agency in effecting this restoration, however delicate and hard to be perceived the distinction of what the Spirit does, from what the renewed man does in consequence of the Spirit's work, we are forbidden by the Scriptures to deny the one, and we are forbidden by our consciousness to deny the other: we believe both. Because we receive the Scriptures as the word of God, and because we regard the human mind as the work of God, we are persuaded that these independent testimonies

to separate aspects of the same process are not contradictory, but harmonious.

In now attempting to illustrate the moral energy of the spiritual life in man, we propose to discuss these four positions :—

First : The work of the Spirit in renewing the *sinner* is not essential to the responsibility and obligation of the *man*.

Secondly : The spiritual life which we ascribe to the work of the Holy Ghost in man produces, as its natural fruit, whatever can be included in the highest and most refined morality.

Thirdly : This spiritual life secures results which transcend the aims of ethical philosophy, or of conventional morality.

Fourthly : As the conclusion of our entire argument,—the practical energy of the spiritual life displays the distinct yet harmonious workings of the spirit of man, and of the Spirit of God.

I. THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN RENEWING THE SINNER IS NOT ESSENTIAL TO THE RESPONSIBILITY AND OBLIGATION OF THE MAN.

We have acknowledged, in a former Lecture, that, in a large and just sense of the words, all that is noble and excellent in man's capacities is the work of the creating Spirit. We are equally ready to acknowledge that whatever goodness there is in man may be truly attributed to that Spirit's grace. We are hard to believe that good thoughts, desires, or purposes have any other origin than the fountain of all good, which is God. Consist-

ently, as we believe, with these acknowledgments, it is, nevertheless, our judgment that the renewing power of the Spirit of God is set forth in the New Testament as a power which always accomplishes its purpose, and, consequently, that it works only in those who are eventually saved.

It is beside our present design to enter now on any of the questions naturally suggested by this avowal. Christians know that numerous passages of Scripture have often been alleged on behalf of what is called the Calvinian doctrine of grace, by those who are not less concerned to maintain the theoretical integrity and the practical exemplification of all personal and social virtues:—and Christians know, likewise, that numerous passages of Scripture have been alleged on behalf of what is called the Arminian system, by persons who are not less concerned to ascribe the salvation of a sinner to the grace of God. Whilst in the main adhering to the Calvinian doctrine, for the reasons usually assigned by those who hold it, we are not forgetful of that which appears to weigh most with intelligent and conscientious believers in preferring the opposite doctrine. In their apprehension, the Calvinian theory of grace is inconsistent with the strong language in which the Scriptures declare the love of God in Christ to all mankind, with the equitable administration of the Divine government, and with the moral judgments of mankind. Others are convinced that these things are not really inconsistent; and, were this the fitting occasion for

so doing, it might be shown in argument, that the principles involved in the statements of Scripture respecting grace, as understood by Calvinists, are *fundamentally* the same as those involved in the statements of Scripture respecting the Divine government, and in the moral judgment of mankind, as interpreted by Arminians. But the position now before us requires that we should deal with a question which, to a certain extent, has been regarded in the same light by eminent theologians, as well as by ordinary Christians, of both these schools, and by others who would not generally be included in either the one or the other. The question is this: Does the Spirit of God incline all men by that which is called "common grace" to receive the Gospel, or with or without the Gospel, to love God? The belief that the Spirit of God does so incline men has been widely spread. The distinction between the Calvinist and the Arminian, alike holding this doctrine, is, that the Arminian looks to the free-will of man, and the Calvinist to the special grace of God, for the difference between him who resists, and him who obeys, these motions of the Spirit in the soul. It is not to the distinction between these parties that our attention will now be given, but, rather, to the doctrine in which they agree.

That there are "previous workings" corresponding with the *gratia præveniens* of Augustine and the schoolmen, and that these are "operations of common grace," we may freely admit; only the sense

which we attach to such terms and phrases is that which we have ascribed, in the second Lecture, to the work of the Spirit *as a Teacher*. Believing, as we do, that the goodness of God is exhibited to every man in the world to lead him to repentance, and that the exhibition of that goodness may without impropriety be attributed to the Spirit, we, nevertheless, do not consider this as the same work with that which is referred to in the New Testament where men are said to be “born of the Spirit” or “renewed by the Holy Ghost.”—Man’s responsibility to God is undoubtedly increased by every gift which God vouchsafes to him, whatever that gift may be, and more specially by the intellectual and moral capacities without which, in some degree, he could not be responsible at all. It were mere stupidity to deny that our responsibility to God is heightened by the means of knowledge and of persuasion which are furnished by the written Scriptures, by the oral ministry of the Gospel, and by all the exemplifications of holy life which, at any time, are presented to the world by the church. It is altogether a different matter, however, to ascribe these elements of responsibility to the direct and inward operations of the *grace* of the Spirit on the human heart; and this latter is the view which is now under consideration. Nothing seems to us to be more plain and obvious than the simple position—that sin implies previous responsibility, and that the condemnation of sin is right. But whatever is done by the Spirit of God to turn a man from

sin is done, not as a matter of right to constitute the man responsible, but as a matter of grace to deliver him from the consequences of the sin for which he is righteously condemned. To speak of such a work of the Spirit as necessary to make a man responsible to God is, in our judgment, to confound grace with right, and thus to involve a contradiction. It may be a display of Divine favour towards a creature to endow him with the capacities for the use of which he is held responsible; and it is owing to the exuberance of the Divine favour that the helps afforded for knowing what is right, and the reasons for doing what is right, are so varied, so abundant, and so continually pressed upon our minds; but to represent such manifestations of Divine goodness as being the same thing with that which the Scriptures set before us as “the power that worketh in us” for our salvation, is, according to our apprehension, to overlook one of the clearest of the manifold distinctions which abound in the writings of the apostles. — Whether or not there be such preparatory, tentative, conditional, and resistible, actings of the Spirit of God directly on the spirit of man, is a question which men will be apt to determine according to the theological school in which their minds have been trained, or according to the creed by which, so far as they are concerned, inquiry may have been superseded by the submission which is substituted for conviction: we are free to say that we have never been able to gather

an affirmative answer to this question from the unfettered study of the Holy Scriptures : in other words, we do not believe that such a doctrine is taught in the Scriptures.

The doctrine of which we are speaking is, for the most part, implied in the assertion of other doctrines, rather than independently laid down ; and even when it is asserted, it is not expressed in such definite terms as a controvertist would wish to handle, but in vague and general phrases. It is said to be a Divine influence soliciting the sinner, striving with him, producing all the mental convictions and emotions which are the antecedents of conversion, but not resulting in conversion until the sinner, thus solicited and striven with, complies with the solicitations, and of his own free-will gives up the strife. It appears to be held that without these visitations of grace a sinner cannot repent, or believe the Gospel, or perform good works ; that they often come unsought and suddenly ; that men are passive in becoming the subjects of them ; that they are sometimes irresistible ; that they may be improved, or made of none effect.*

It is not taught, so far as we have learned, that this grace is equally bestowed on all men ; but the inequality is thought to be compensated by the principle of moral government which requires little where little has been given.

* See Clarke's Posthumous Sermons, vol. ii. p. 265. Tillotson's Sermons, vol. ii. p. 280. Jortin's Six Dissertations. Edwards, Ludlam, Wesley, and Watson.

The passages of Scripture adduced in support of this doctrine include all those which have been referred to in a former Lecture of this series as proving that the Spirit of God condemns men by His truth, and that they resist Him. Besides such passages, there are those in which the Spirit is said to be “given to every man to profit withal;” those in which the Spirit is spoken of as “quenched” and “grieved;” and those in which men are described as “doing despite unto the Spirit of grace.” To these declarations of Scripture are added the descriptions of Herod hearing John gladly, of Felix trembling when Paul reasoned, and of Agrippa being almost persuaded, by the same reasoner, to become a Christian. Now we do not discover, in any of these parts of Scripture, the assertion of that direct acting on the hearts of men—distinct from the operations of truth and conscience—which we understand to be asserted in the doctrine we are considering. There appears to us to be a plain and wide difference between the language of all these passages and the language which is used in the New Testament to express the grace of the Spirit by which men are renewed, purified, and saved. In most of the instances to which the reference is made, there is either the express or the implied mention of the truth of God presented to the minds of men; and, since that truth is revealed by the Holy Spirit, we hold it to be scriptural to ascribe all these operations,—in that sense, not in any other,—to the grace of the Spirit. No thought-

ful student of the New Testament can fail to observe that the “grieving of the Spirit” is an offence against which those are warned who are said—in the same passage—to be “sealed by the Spirit unto the day of redemption;” and that the grieving of the Spirit against which they are thus warned, consists in the corrupt communications, and in the unkind spirit to which the example of those around might mislead, or the faults they see in one another might provoke, them.*

The “quenching of the Spirit” was understood by all the ancient commentators whose works remain, as relating to the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit: and the exhortation was explained by some as directed against the suppression of the exercise of these gifts in their brethren; while by others it was explained as directed against the neglect or perversion of them by the persons on whom they were bestowed.

The declaration that “the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal,” belongs to the same subject, as must be clear to any one who reads the connection.†—Let it be assumed, indeed, on whatever grounds, that there is such a work of the Spirit in all men as that which is generally understood by such phrases as “universal” or “common grace,” and no great ingenuity would then be needed to *express that notion in the words of Scripture*; but this is not

* See Ephes. iv. 17 to end.

† See 1 Cor. xii. 1—11.

Biblical interpretation, and, therefore, not Christian theology.—It is mortifying to have occasion to refer, in such a discussion, to the irrelevant and deceptive illustration of the “common” grace of the Spirit by the miracle wrought on the “man which had his hand withered.” What resemblance is there between a “withered hand,” and an un-renewed heart; between a man anxious for bodily healing, and a soul unwilling to repent; or between a restoration which precedes the stretching forth of the hand, and a restoration which follows the assent of the mind? Even if there were any resemblance, how could a single case illustrate a doctrine which has to do with many cases in which the results are opposite? Were there any men with withered hands, who received power from Jesus to stretch them forth, but did *not* stretch them forth?

It would not be fair to infer from these reasonings and expositions that we are denying that God has access to the hearts of all men; that He ever visits men in a mysterious way to move them to what is right and good; or that He is to be devoutly contemplated, addressed in prayer, and acknowledged in praise, as the author of all good thoughts, desires, and purposes. We have aimed at showing no more than this,—namely, that such actings of ineffable grace cannot be justly regarded as necessary to the responsibility of man for his own deeds; and that, whether it be true or not that such grace is universally bestowed, the

doctrine which maintains the affirmative does not appear to us to be taught in those parts of Scripture on which its advocates have relied for proving it.*

II. THE SPIRITUAL LIFE WHICH WE ASCRIBE TO THE WORK OF THE HOLY GHOST IN MAN PRODUCES, AS ITS NATURAL FRUIT, WHATEVER CAN BE INCLUDED IN THE HIGHEST AND MOST REFINED MORALITY.

What we mean by “spiritual life” is the right disposition of man towards God. As our relation to Him includes all our moral relations, it is manifest that in proportion as this central and all-comprehending relation is religiously borne, the duties of inferior and subordinate relations will be conscientiously regarded, and punctually discharged. These minor duties have been apprehended, though rudely and imperfectly, by the least cultivated of mankind. They have been described with much beauty by ancient writers, urged with dignity by didactic moral teachers, and illustrated more or less by the historians, poets, and biographers, of nearly

* This doctrine was stated with much clearness and succinctness by the late Mr. J. J. Gurney in his *Observations on the distinguishing views and practices of the Society of Friends*. In 1836 Dr. Wardlaw published his *Friendly Letters to the Society of Friends*, in which he set forth what he conceived to be the Scriptural objections to some of their distinguishing principles. Six years after, Mr. Gurney republished his observations; but I cannot trace, in any part of the volume, the slightest reference to Dr. Wardlaw’s lucid, calm, and gentle letters. How is this? Is the bondage of *reading only on one side* a part of Christian freedom?

every language. It will scarcely be denied, nevertheless, that the purest morals have been taught by Christian writers; and it could be shown that they have been practised with more consistency by believers of what are called Evangelical doctrines than by any other men. We are not questioning that much of what the world justly admires as moral excellence is produced by motives which are not peculiar to the Gospel, not the effects of its characteristic principles. Neither do we question that even such examples of virtue are often, if not always, the results of mental operations which our argument does not prevent our attributing to the Spirit of God. We see no reason for supposing either that the grace revealed in the Gospel for the salvation of sinners is injured by acknowledging every proved instance of social excellence in men, or that the Divine government is shorn of any portion of its authority by admitting the popular Christian belief that God is the author of all good. Principles of truth are ever harmonious with each other. The principles peculiar to the Gospel harmonize with whatever true principles are derived from other sources. Inspired teachers uniformly proceed on the assumption and recognition of this fundamental harmony. The false in morals cannot be true in theology. The false in theology cannot be true in morals.

In the further elucidation of this position, let it be observed:—

(1.) That the design for which the renewing

power of the Holy Spirit works in man, includes everything that can be included in a moral system.

In looking at the design of Christianity, as it is unfolded in its own documents, we perceive how widely it differs from nearly all human systems in the perfect accuracy with which it recognizes the laws of our natural constitution. It aims not at the merely outward reformation of man in those aspects which constitute his character, as witnessed by his fellow-men, nor at the creation of any capacities, whether physical or moral, in addition to those which are essential to the completeness of his constitution as man. Nor does it deal with him as an abstraction, but as he is felt and known to be—a thinking, self-judging, and accountable agent, living in the actual world, and preparing for the real consequences of his present living, in that unseen state which is yet before him.

Again: it is not with man in masses, nor with those relations which subsist between one man and another, that Christianity is, primarily, concerned; but with each person, separately by himself, as he is related to God and to eternity. What Christianity proposes is, the restoration of each man to the normal type of humanity, to the Divine idea embodied in the model which is presented by “the man Christ Jesus.” Nothing can be more just in our estimate of Christianity than the belief that it leads man’s thoughts, his reliance, and his hopes, away from himself, by presenting to him an outward expiation as the one ground of his approval

on the part of God, and, at the same time, presenting to him a power which is not his, as the source of all the spiritual strength in which he is to rely on the Saviour's mediation, and to fulfil in his life the requirements of righteousness and the purposes of grace. And yet, on the surface of the Christian doctrines there lies the truth which pervades them with the order and uniformity of a principle—that a man is himself to repent of his sins, to believe the Gospel for his personal salvation, and of his own accord to do the things which are pleasing to God because they are the things which ought to be done by him. Whatever, therefore, can be comprehended within the theoretical requirements of a moral system, is doctrinally included among the designs of Christianity; and the elevation and goodness which are approved by the most enlightened and cultivated conscience will be found among the appropriate fruits of the Spirit in the character of the renovated man. Picture to yourself everything that philosophy has truly predicated of the perfect man, robed in the graces which poetry has fancied, and practically bearing the several tests which the experience of a disappointed world applies to the examination of a human being, and you have not imagined anything grander, lovelier, or of more substantial worth, than the character which it is the aim of Christianity, as the work of the Holy Spirit, to produce. It is a doctrinal error to conceive otherwise of the instruction which has been perpetuated in the

writings of inspired men: for, however largely the apostles insist on the fact of the Atonement, and on the fact of the Spirit dwelling in believers, it may be fairly said that they do not insist less fully, or less earnestly, on the necessity of practical conversion from all evil to all good, in the lives of their disciples.

There may be some advantage in the scholastic distinction between doctrines and precepts; but when we think without the fetters of human systems, and utter freely what we think, neither fearing men nor seeking their favour, we speak with the accuracy of Scripture in saying, that every doctrine taught is a precept, and every precept enforced is a doctrine. We have no reverence, indeed, for the narrow and superficial ethics which are set up against the characteristic principles of the Gospel; nor have we any liking for the barren intellectualism which overlooks the broad adaptation of Christianity to the entire man.—It will not be gravely contended by those who reverence the authority on which we believe the Gospel, that men need not be careful either to hold fast, or to defend, the principles which constitute that Gospel, so long as their deeds are such as no man blames. Strong arguments have, we confess, been offered, on behalf of such a style of thinking: we are neither ignorant, nor forgetful—nor disdainful—of such arguments; but the principle assumed in all of them is one which would reduce Christianity to nothing; would destroy it at the root: turn-

ing its august annunciations, sublime mysteries, stupendous facts, and awful sanctions, into the mere burlesque of a fantastic superstition. If it be not true that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, graciously taking human flesh upon him, as the substitute for guilty man, then what mean the long line of heralds proclaiming his advent in the symbols of foregoing ages, and the marvellous history, and complicated worship, of the people among whom He was to arise ?

What, in that case, is the *rationale* of the strange tragedy which includes such tears as man had never wept, such words as ears had never heard, virtues such as the creation has witnessed in none other, and suffering which no imagination is strong enough to paint ? What *worth* is there in the miracles of His life, or in the clearly and strongly attested report of His rising from the dead, and of His ascent, in human form, to heaven ? What did the first preachers of the Gospel mean by preaching "Christ crucified," as "the wisdom" and "the power of God ?" If it be admitted that these are the historical truths of our religion, then is it wise, we ask, is it philosophical, is it religious, right, or *safe*, to teach morality without them, or in their stead ?

While we thus repudiate so shallow a mode of treating apostolic Christianity, we have renounced all sympathy, on the other hand, with those who conceive of that Christianity apart from the results which prove the grandeur of its facts, and the power

of its principles. Our fixed relations, and our mutable relations as well, involve the notion that there are certain things which we are to do while holding those relations. This is true, independently of the Gospel. The Gospel is also proved to be true. But apart from the truth respecting our relations and duties—and of another truth too, not less evident, namely, that we have forfeited our well-being by not doing what the relation we sustain required of us,—we are not conscious of any mental conceptions which the language of the Gospel can intelligibly express.

Let us state the plainest of all evangelical truths in the plainest words:—a sinner who repents is pardoned by Divine grace, and renewed by the Holy Ghost, for the sake of Jesus Christ, in whom he believes that he may be saved. Why should he repent, but because he had no right to sin? Why should he be pardoned, but in order to his being renewed? Why is he renewed, but that he may “walk in newness of life?”

(2.) Conformably with this manifest design of Christianity, the inspired teachers never shrank from using the highest moral tone in every part of their instructions. They were the servants of God, mysteriously clothed with a delegated authority from Him; and by that authority they commanded men to repent, to believe in Christ, to forsake sin, to do justice, to be merciful, to be ever on their guard against temptation, to hold a firm restraint on all the tendencies to evil which had displayed their

apostate condition, and which had been strengthened by the habits that formed their early character. These authoritative requirements, in which the original laws of our moral nature are sanctioned by a miraculous revelation, are still in force. No immoral man can be a Christian. No departure from the strictest requirements of rectitude and purity can be justly attributed to the work of the Holy Spirit. Holiness, as portrayed in the New Testament, is, indeed, a higher quality of the spiritual nature, than morality; but it is so far from being inconsistent with morality, that every requirement of the former expressly implies the inculcation of the latter.

III. THIS SPIRITUAL LIFE SECURES RESULTS WHICH TRANSCEND THE AIMS OF ETHICAL PHILOSOPHY, OR OF CONVENTIONAL MORALITY.

The reader of the New Testament is familiar with the language in which the Saviour and His apostles insist on the necessity of holiness, and expound the principles and the power by which the holiness of Christians is secured. As the wisdom and goodness of God are made manifest in the visible creation, His government of man is the development of His eternal rectitude, that rectitude which requires in man the highest moral perfectness which a creature with such faculties, and surrounded by so rich a field of objective motives, can attain. Apart from this moral perfectness, loved and aimed at, and progressively acquired, there can be no religion. When the Spirit

of God does *that* which results in what our Lord describes as being “born of the Spirit,” and what His apostles describe as “the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost,” the immediate production is not a holy life, nor a holy choice, but *that* without which a holy choice is never made, nor a holy life ever seen. The life is the renewed man’s life, the manifestation of the inward principle from which he acts. The choice, in its very nature, as choice, is the renewed man’s own; free, not necessitated; original, not the effect of any cause which is external to himself.

In accordance with these principles, there are two series of communications in the evangelical writings, sometimes distinct in form, sometimes blended, sometimes implicative the one of the other, never contradictory, but always harmonious. There are declarations to the effect that men are made holy by the Spirit of God—“through the truth,” “by the washing of water by the word,”—“in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.”* There are, also, calls to personal holiness, prohibitions of all sin, numerous instances in which private or social faults are condemned, and the practice of every human virtue is made the theme of earnest remonstrance, admonition, entreaty, or commendation.

Assuming, as plain principles of the New Testa-

* John xvii. 17; Eph. v. 26; 1 Cor. vi. 11.

ment, that, while the obligation to these moral excellences lies on every man, whether he be a Christian or not,—that Christianity, instead of annulling, confirms the original obligation,—and that the obligation is not fulfilled by any but those who become Christians, and continue to be Christians, by the power of the Spirit—we must not overlook the fact that the moral inculcation accompanies the revelation of the characteristic truths of the Gospel, pleads the same authority, and is comprehended in the Gospel with the same clearness, with which its peculiar principles are expressed. If man had no conscience, Christianity would be neither intelligible, nor necessary, nor possible. To resolve its holy principles—they are all pre-eminently holy—into merely speculative propositions, is to do that which the apostles never did, and which our reverence for the intellectual giants who have drawn up creeds, or defended them, must not prevent our saying, we believe no Christian can do without running into error, and, as we fear, falling into sin. *The New Testament is not a book of propositions.* He who tears its words from their connection to support what he believes to be a correct definition of its doctrines, has already done more mischief by the method, than he can do good by the arguments, of his orthodoxy. Let logic be applied in the refutation of the errors which are propagated by its perversion: but the logic of the schools is not an element in the divinely appointed method

of *teaching* Christianity “as the truth is in Jesus.”

Many theories have been formed for the purpose of explaining the nature of Christian holiness, and many practical treatises have been written to enforce the detail of personal habits by which it has been supposed that it might be secured. Questions have been raised, and sometimes hotly disputed, whether or not the perfection of holiness is attainable; whether it has ever been actually reached by Christians on earth; and whether the attainment, if made at all, has been reached by the slow progress of self-denial and prayer, or bestowed at once by some sudden manifestation of the Spirit's power. These are, of all questions, perhaps, those which demand the largest amount of calm thought, and of meek temper, in endeavouring to consider them. None can be more full of interest for a good man.

It will be readily acknowledged that the holiness which is required in man is perfect; that if this perfect holiness were not attainable, it would not be required; that where it is not attained, the fault is in man; that if it be attained, it is by the grace of the Holy Spirit; and that, whether it be attained or not in this life, it will be the common character of all the redeemed hereafter, for they are “just men made perfect,”—“saints in light.”

Not less readily will it be acknowledged that there are many passages in the New Testament

in which certain Christian believers are spoken of as "perfect." In some of these passages, however, it will be generally affirmed by as many as have seriously examined the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures—that entire sinlessness is not the idea expressed by the words translated "perfect." In one of them, "the perfect" are "men," as distinguished from children; in another, they are persons more advanced than others in knowledge and discernment; in a third, they are the pre-eminently holy, as compared with others.* Keeping these acknowledgments and affirmations in view, it remains to consider whether the perfection of Christian sanctity, that is to say, entire freedom from sin, is represented in the Scriptures as a momentary, sudden, or conscious change in believers of the Gospel. They who hold the opinion that entire freedom from sin is so represented in the Scriptures appear to ground this conviction on the alleged consciousness of particular persons, and on the violence which, as they conceive, would be done to those passages of Scripture in which holiness is described, and especially to the promises of all needful grace in answer to believing prayer. To the consciousness of particular persons, we are neither disposed, nor able, to offer any contradiction: at the same time, all persons are liable to err in their interpretation of the Scriptures,

* 1 Cor. xiv. 20; ii. 6; Phil. iii. 15; Heb. v. 14; vi. 1; —Jas. iii. 2, compared with Gen. vi. 9; Deut. xviii. 13; 2 Kings xxii. 26.

and in their judgment of the agreement of their consciousness with the word of God.

We are unable to perceive the force of the reasonings on behalf of the doctrine of entire sanctification, in the present life, which are grounded on the requirements and promises of Scripture. That he who never fails to keep the commandments of God, and whose faith in His promises is unwavering, becomes perfect at that point at which this begins to be true, there can be no doubt; but the question is, where is he of whom these things can be infallibly asserted? We are not saying that this is impossible. We do not object to the attainment of all that any Christian mind can mean by holiness, nor would we discourage any Christian from seeking by prayer the grace which alone can make men perfect. We have no plea to urge on behalf of any imperfection in the thoughts, affections, or outward life of any man. We do not imagine that there is any uncontrollable necessity for sin in any being in the universe. We are, to say the least, doubtful of the wisdom or the safety of the casuistry that would nicely adjust the limits that separate the sinless from the sinful, the natural from the moral, the infirmity from the transgression:—though such distinctions, we are persuaded, there must be, and actually are.

Whatever be the case described by St. Paul in the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans—whether it be, as we think it is, the record of his

own experience, or the personation of another—whether the description applies to one who has not yet become a Christian, or as we think it does, to the conflict between “the old man” and “the new man,” in the regenerate—we do not see how it can determine the question of *fact* which we are at present considering.* That fact, like every other, must be considered in connection with the evidence offered for its reality.—There is, however, one passage in which it is plainly and positively asserted “whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God;” and again, “we know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not; but he that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not.”†

It is manifest that the apostle means more than the obligation under which the regenerate are placed to abstain from sin; for the same obligation applies to every man, whether he be regenerate or not. The apostle does not assert the absolute impossibility of sin in the regenerate, but the certainty that the regenerate will not, and do not, sin. It will scarcely be considered as legitimate interpretation to say—these words mean that it is more difficult for the regenerate than for the unregenerate to sin, or that, into whatever sin he may fall by forgetting his dependence on grace, or by neglecting the duty of

* See Note P.

† 1 John iii. 9; v. 18.

Christian vigilance, a son of God is not, and cannot be conceived of as being, a wilful and habitual sinner. The language of the apostle is too clear and strong to admit of our being satisfied with such an exposition of their meaning. But, on the other hand, there is no foundation in the apostle's language for the opinion that, because all men ought to keep themselves from sin, and because the grace of God is ever at hand to help those who will diligently avail themselves of His aid, while it may be the privilege of all, it is the actual experience of only some, believers to live entirely without sin: for what the apostle here says, as distinctly and strongly as he says anything else in this epistle, is said of *none but those who are born of God*, and of *every one that is born of God*. We need not be at a loss to understand what is meant by being born of God. What then is meant by the assertion "his seed remaineth in him," and by giving that fact as the reason why he in whom this "seed remaineth" "doth not commit sin,"—"cannot sin,"—"keepeth himself?"

The comparison of the word of God to seed,—the figure being sometimes botanical,* and sometimes physiological,†—has led expositors, both ancient and modern, to understand the figurative language of this passage as, in like manner, denoting the word of God. But the idea thus pro-

* As in Matt. xiii. 3—32.

† As in 1 Pet. i. 23.

duced, would not agree, in form, with the style of John as a writer. Not the "word of God," but "the Spirit of God," is the phrase used by *him* in describing the power or the principle of spiritual life in those who are "born of God." The term "seed" has a reference to being "born (or begotten) of God," and it is a figure of the same kind.*

We consider this expression of the apostle as asserting the permanent indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the regenerate, and as assigning that as the reason why he says "whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin,"—"cannot sin,"—"sinneth not,"—"keepeth himself."—Then how are we to understand the declarations "whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin,"—"sinneth not,"—"keepeth himself?" Whatever we understand by them, it is not true of any but of those who are born of God, and it is alike and equally true of every one who is born of God. We do not understand these words as affirming that no regenerate person sins, or can sin, in the most obvious sense in which the word sin is most generally meant as any transgression of the Divine law.—A difficulty presses on all the interpretations of these passages with which we are acquainted. The choice appears to lie between the two which shall now be mentioned.

* Compare the Gospel of John iii. 5—8. See in the Appendix, Note Q.

(1.) It has been thought that the apostle means, by the expressions now before us, that freedom from sin is secured to every one of the regenerate who “keepeth himself,” that is, who cherishes a devout sense of the Spirit’s presence with him, confidently relies on that Spirit’s power, and in the strength thus imparted to him watches, and prays, and resists all temptation, whether from within, or from without. We cannot question that this is true. Yet it is not the full meaning of the apostle’s words. He mentions no conditions of any kind; on the contrary, there is an authoritative and unqualified affirmation respecting *every one who is born of God*.

(2.) Both the apostle and those to whom his epistle was primarily addressed, may have understood these words as meaning not sin in general, or, indiscriminately any sin whatever, of any kind or degree, but *one particular sin*, of which he speaks especially towards the close of the epistle. That he does not refer to sin generally, or indiscriminately to any sin whatever, of any kind or degree, might be gathered from the current strain, and from special expressions, of the epistle. When he speaks of himself and his brethren whom he addresses as “born of God,” he refers to such acknowledgments of sin, forgiveness of sin, and motives for avoiding sin, as relate both to his own experience and to that of his fellow-believers. He tells them, with exquisite simplicity and tenderness,—“My little children, these things I write unto you

that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, the righteous one; and He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world. Whoso keepeth His word, in him verily is the love of God perfected; hereby know we that we are in Him. He that saith he abideth in Him ought himself also to walk even as He walked." We do not suppose that the apostle, by what he says in the passage we are now examining, contradicted what he had said before. Moreover, the context of the fifth chapter shews that there was "a sin unto death," which the apostle distinguishes from "a sin not unto death." The simplest solution, therefore, of the difficulty arising from a seeming contradiction, appears in *this distinction made by the apostle himself*.—According to our apprehension, the first epistle of John plainly teaches, that all sin is a transgression of law; that those who are born of God are specially bound to avoid all sin; that if, notwithstanding, they do sin, they are to confess their sins; that the confession of sins by those who are born of God is made with faith in the propitiation of the Sinless One; that they obtain forgiveness; that the design of this epistle, as of all Scripture, is to condemn sin, and to prevent it; and that by whomsoever the "sin unto death" may be committed, it is not, cannot be, and will not be, committed by one who is born of God, *because in him the Spirit of God abides*.

The “perfection” to which it is the duty of all men to aspire, and which is the object of hope, struggle, and believing prayer, to the regenerate, is gradually approached by true Christians; and it will be fully attained—in heaven.

The mode of striving after this blessed state of sinlessness has varied according to the views which have been entertained of the nature of holiness. Not a few have been misled by a false philosophy, and by ascetic notions, examples, and habits, to seek it by vigils, fasts, and penances. Others have relied, mainly, on their power of habitual self-government, under the guidance of inspired precepts, and with vague ideas of the aid of the Holy Spirit. Others again have regarded their progress in holiness as the passive result of the Spirit’s grace, with a partial, if not total, oversight of the essentially *active* character in which that progress is continually set forth in Scripture. He who takes a calm view of the entire case will see that to make progress in holiness is to be “sanctified by the Holy Ghost”—“through the belief of the truth”—“by faith that is in” Jesus; and that all who are thus “sanctified” are conscious of the connection of their spiritual progress with the simplicity of their reliance on the mediation of Christ, with the sincerity of their prayers for grace, and with the earnestness and constancy with which they resist temptation, and cultivate the tempers and habitudes so plainly enjoined on them by Divine authority, and exemplified

with perfect majesty, grace, and symmetry, in the character of Him whose name they bear.*

* Out of many treatises on Christian perfection, I have renewed the examination of those by Macarius, Bates, and Law, as well as the interesting sermons of the Rev. John Wesley. Macarius is highly evangelical, with the ascetic tinge of an Egyptian anchorite. Bates is richly imbued with the tone which pervades the writings of Saint Paul, but not without the "dogmatic" element of the English puritans. Law is ethical, rather than spiritual. Wesley writes like a holy man, a respectable scholar, and acute logician, as he was; yet he is occasionally indiscriminate, as it appears to me, in the citation of Scripture passages to support his doctrine: he also laboured under the great disadvantage of being involved in controversies which I should hope no wise and holy man in any church would wish to revive.

Let me here recommend the judicious and evangelical treatise entitled *The Spirit of Holiness; and Sanctification through the Truth*. By James Harington Evans, minister of John Street chapel. Fourth edition, revised. 1848. I have read it with eminent advantage; and I know of few compositions which exhibit, in so small a compass, and in such a truly Christian spirit, the scriptural doctrine of personal holiness.

I would take this opportunity of also recommending Mr. Philip's "*Comforter*," and *The Enquirer directed to an Experimental and Practical View of the Work of the Holy Spirit*. By Octavius Winslow, M.A. Fifth edition, enlarged. 1849. To the same class belong the attractive writings of Dr. Vinet, of Lausanne, of which several have been translated by Mr. Turnbull, of Boston (New England), and published by Mr. Collins, Glasgow. Dr. Dewar's work, entitled *The Holy Spirit*, is a valuable and luminous exposition of "sound doctrine." Dr. Morison's *Christianity in its Power* is too well known by those who are likely to read this note to require such commendation as it deserves. Happy will it be for the churches of England and America when they respond to the stirring appeals of Dr. Jenkyn, in his *Union of the Spirit and the Church in the Conversion of the World*. The Rev. Gilbert Wardlaw, also, has just published a volume entitled *Experimental*

Fourthly.—The sum of our entire argument is, that THE PRACTICAL ENERGY OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE DISPLAYS THE DISTINCT, YET HARMONIOUS, WORKINGS OF THE SPIRIT OF MAN, AND OF THE SPIRIT OF GOD.

It has been the purpose of the Lectures, now concluded, to take a comprehensive survey of doctrines respecting the work of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of man. This purpose has led to an examination of man himself, in that respect in which he is the subject of the work in question; then to an exhibition of what the Scriptures teach respecting the work of the Holy Spirit generally, and especially of His work in actually saving man. In contrast with the Scriptures I have presented the notions of churches, and the dreams of mystics. I have compared the consciousness of Christians with the word of God. I have pursued the results of the Spirit's work as they are developed in the practical operation of moral principles, and in the spiritual power of Christian holiness.—Fearful of omitting, or misrepresenting, the explanations of the harmony between the spiritual life and revealed truth which thoughtful and religious writers have given, I have used such diligence as I could command in reading what

Evidence a ground for Assurance that Christianity is Divine. The third, fourth, and fifth chapters are well worthy of attention as bearing on some of the topics handled in these Lectures; and the entire work is one which treats with discrimination, and in a chaste and elegant style, a subject on which it is remarkable that so little has been written.

they had written, that I might be instructed by them. I have compared these human writings with the word of God.—Let me, in conclusion, declare, with simplicity and plainness, the issue of these studies.

I have no doubt that when men turn to God there is a direct work of the Holy Spirit in their hearts; that there is, also, a *consequent* operation of the truth believed by the converted to induce them to turn to God, and to excite and encourage them to the attainment of perfect holiness; that it is the Holy Spirit's power within them that renders them willing to attend to that which the same Spirit teaches them in His word; that in attending to that teaching, and in following it, they act with the entire freedom of their intellectual and moral constitution; that the operations of material nature are not analogous to the agency of spiritual being, and that philosophy has not yet explained either the one or the other; that I am not warranted to say, the truth is the means of beginning the spiritual life, though I am unable to conceive of that life in man being *developed* otherwise than by his free, practical, and devout belief of the truth which the Holy Spirit has revealed.

Short of this I cannot stop. Beyond this I do not go. I honour the gifts, and appreciate the motives, of the men,—whether dead or living,—from whom my deliberate judgment leads me to dissent. But to me the work of the Holy Spirit is, at this

hour, what it has ever been—a mystery. I receive the declarations of Scripture on this subject with reverent faith: I have laboured to expound them, here and elsewhere, according to the measure of ability for which I feel that I must render an account unto God, and with whatever light of knowledge He has enabled me to acquire. In them I read, what is to me, a plain revelation of the fact that the Spirit of God works immediately in the spirit of man for the salvation of his soul, and for the redemption of his body; and, also, the fact,—to which consciousness bears witness,—that he in whose spirit the Divine work begins, gives proof that it has so begun in him, by believing the Gospel, and by leading a life of watchfulness and prayer, of humble trust in Christ, of reliance on the promises of grace, and of patient preparation for that world where his holiness will be complete, and where his blessedness will last for ever.

APPENDIX.

A. (page 6.)

THE sacred writers have applied to the immortal constitution of man, the following terms:—

נֶפֶשׁ, רֵיחַ, נְשָׁמָה, לֵב, *Ψυχὴ, Πνεῦμα, Noûs, Διάνοια, Κάρδια*.—נֶפֶשׁ, is applied to an odour, breath, life, appetite, mind or affections, a living being, one's self.

רֵיחַ, is applied to breath, wind, life, mind, disposition, will, purpose.

נְשָׁמָה, is applied to breath, passion, soul.

לֵב, is applied to the seat or principle of bodily life; to mental emotions; to motive or principle of action; will; purpose; the faculty of thinking; wisdom; prudence.

Ψυχὴ, is applied *primarily* to breath; life; to that which lives; man, (plural, men;) that which thinks.

Πνεῦμα, is applied to wind, or air in motion; the vital breath; invisible agents; the essence of man; the separate or combined faculties which think, reason, choose, in opposition to what is material; the internal character of religion as opposed to the letter; intention; sentiment; mode of thinking; to God; specially to the Holy Ghost.

Noûs, is applied to the mind with all its faculties; understanding, judgment; knowledge; the act of thinking; will; purpose.

Διάνοια, is applied to intellect; sound reason; thought; agitation of mind; a perverse mode of thinking and feeling.

Κάρδια, is applied to the interior of anything; to the faculties, thoughts, and affections of the mind, intellect, will, desire, intention, memory, conscience, thoughts. See, for the Hebrew words, *Concordantiæ Fürstii*. Lipsiæ, 1840; and *Lexicon Manuale Heb. et Chald.* Gesenii, Lipsiæ, 1833. For the Greek words, see *Schleusneri Nov. Lex. Nov. Test. ed. quart.* 1818.

B. (page 7.)

According to the Pythagoreans, the soul of man consists of two parts, one endowed with reason, and one without reason, *ψυχῆς* δὲ, τὸ μὲν ἦν ἔχον λόγον τόδε οὐκ ἔχον. *Protrept.* pp. 34, 35.

The same philosophy is ascribed to the Platonists. *Antoninus* speaks of *σῶμα*, *ψυχή*, and *νοῦς*. *Irenæus* says, *Perfectus homo constat carne, animo, et spiritu.** *Clemens* of Alexandria says, *Οἱ μὲν τρεῖς σὰρξ δὲ καὶ ψυχὴ καὶ Πνεῦμα.†* *Origen* says—*Ὁ ἄνθρωπος συνεστήκεν, ἐκ σώματος, καὶ ψυχῆς, καὶ Πνεύματος.* *Philocal.* p. 8.—Consult *Whitby* on the New Testament, vol. ii., (4to.) pp. 334, 335.

The psychology of *Schubert*, in his “History of the Soul,” gives great prominence to this distinction. “The soul is the inferior part of our intellectual nature—that which shews itself most distinctly in the phenomena of our dreams—the power of which also is situated in the material constitution of the brain. The spirit, on the contrary, is that part of our nature which tends to the purely rational, the lofty, the divine. The doctrine of the natural and the spiritual man, which we find in the writings of *St. Paul*, may perhaps have formed the basis upon which *Schubert* founded this system of mental dualism. Whatever may have been its origin, however, it forms a very prominent feature in his metaphysical analysis, and affords an explanation of many facts, which is by no means unreasonable or worthless. The feelings, as may be anticipated, play a very considerable part in *Schubert*’s psychology. Feeling, in reference to the *soul*, is the great impulse of all our outward actions, more especially when, by a ray from heaven, it acquires a moral character, and impels us to what is good and virtuous. Feeling, however, with reference to the *spirit*, is of a far higher character, and appears to us in the form of faith—faith which conquers sense, and sight, and the power of death—faith which enables us to realize the Divine, and which gives us at once the longing after, and the full conviction of, an immortal life beyond the tomb.”—*J. D. Morell*’s *Historical and Critical Review of the Speculative Philosophy of Europe in the Nineteenth Century.* Vol. ii. p. 450. Second Edition.

* *Lib. v. c. ix.*† *Strom. 3, p. 454.*

C. (page 16.)

Our only appeal, in a question of human consciousness, is to that consciousness itself, and to the proofs of consciousness which are given in the language and in the conduct of men. As to personal consciousness, I feel that I have power to begin operations which, but for my beginning them, would never be ; I feel that this beginning of operations is my act, the act of my mind ; I, therefore, regard my own mind as the efficient cause of the operations resulting from this act.

Then, as to the proofs that the consciousness of other men is in this respect, like my own : I refer to the general language of mankind, which gives names of an active signification to the *first* of all those operations which originate with the human mind, —as speaking, writing, choosing, preferring, attending,—and which, indeed, is constructed on the obvious distinction between such beginnings of operations, and the *mere continuance* of operations already begun. Even when, from supposed analogy, men speak of the activity of matter, as the activity of fire, of medicine, of steam, of gunpowder, they can easily distinguish this metaphorical activity, which is the mere continuance of the effects of some remote efficient cause, from the real, simple, direct activity of the human mind. All men feel that there is an essential difference between doing what they could, and doing what they could *not*, have left undone. A man who, in falling, pushes down another person, is conscious that this is altogether a different affair from his deliberately knocking that other person down. On this *universal consciousness*, then, we rest our conviction that whatever difficulties philosophers may have found, or made, (and the latter are much more numerous than the former,) in explaining the phenomena of the human mind, that mind is *an originating principle*, an active power.

As these pages are passing through the press I have received a copy of Dr. Harris' "Man Primeval." In the first part, chapter third, section sixth, that able writer has discussed at considerable length, and in a lucid and happy style, the *real* question of man's voluntary agency.

D. (page 69.)

1st. Those passages which describe God as beginning and performing a work in those who are called "believers," "holy persons," "the saved." "Being confident of this very thing, that he which hath begun a good work in you, will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." "Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling: for it is God which worketh in you, both to will and to do, of *his* good pleasure." "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature." "For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received *it* not *as* the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe." "And what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power." "And you *hath he quickened*, who were dead in trespasses and sins." "Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us." "Wherefore we pray always for you, that our God would count you worthy of *this* calling, and fulfil all the good pleasure of *his* goodness, and the work of faith with power."*

2nd. Those passages in which certain persons are spoken of as begotten and born of God. "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, *even* to them that believe on his name. Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures." "Blessed *be* the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible,

* Philippians i. 6; ii. 12, 13; Gal. vi. 15; 1 Thess. ii. 13; Eph. i. 19; ii. 1; iii. 20; 2 Thess. i. 11.

by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." "Who-soever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." "Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God." "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God: and every one that loveth him that begat, loveth him also that is begotten of him. By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep his commandments. For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments; and his commandments are not grievous. For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world; and this is the victory that overcometh the world, *even* our faith. We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not; but he that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not."*

3rd. Those passages in which salvation is ascribed to the "calling," "power," "grace," or "gift of God." "Among whom are ye also the called of Jesus Christ: To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called *to be* saints." "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to *his* purpose." "Paul, called *to be* an apostle of Jesus Christ, through the will of God, and Sosthenes *our* brother, unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called *to be* saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours: God is faithful, by whom ye were called unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord. But unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God." "But as God hath distributed to every man, as the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk." "But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called *me* by his grace." "But ye *are* a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light." "According as his divine power hath given unto us all things that *pertain* unto life and godliness, through

* John i. 12, 13; iii. 3; James i. 18; 1 Pet. i. 3, 23; 1 John iii. 9; iv. 7; v. 1—4, 18.

the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue." "Who hath saved us, and called *us* with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." "And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions *that were* under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." "But by the grace of God I am what I am; and his grace which *was bestowed* upon me was not in vain, but I laboured more abundantly than they all: yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me." "For our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world, and more abundantly to you-ward." "That the name of our Lord Jesus Christ may be glorified in you, and ye in him, according to the grace of our God and the Lord Jesus Christ." "But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us." "And what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power." "Whereof I was made a minister, according to the gift of the grace of God given unto me by the effectual working of his power." "For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God." "Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord and in the power of his might." "For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power." "And now, brethren, I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified." "Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James, to them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, *and* called." "For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people." "And he said, Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father." "For unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer

for his sake." "So then neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth: but God that giveth the increase."*

E. (page 73.)

The apparent verbal contradictions in the language employed to express the personal distinctiveness, and the Divine unity, of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, arise from the *inapplicableness* of words denoting human thoughts, to that which transcends all human thought. There is nothing in man's perceptions, consciousness, or formal logical definitions, to supply him with intelligible terms that can ever be more than an approximation towards the *exact* and *full* truth of the unity of God. For this reason, theology cannot become a *strictly logical science*; language is too imperfect, too low a vehicle, to become the exponent of its higher truths. I cannot speak for others, but for my own part, I can truly say that the study of the *Summa Theologiæ* of Aquinas has convinced me that those whose minds have not been disciplined in Aristotelian and scholastic forms of thought, are nearly sure to be misled by the language—the particular terms I mean—of those intellectual Titans. The same philosophy was used in common by the orthodox, and by their opponents: they attached the same meaning to the same terms; the former contended for what was well understood by both parties in the terms, *unio physica*, and *unio logica*; their opponents separated those two: the Sabellians adhering to the *unio physica* only; and the Arians to the *unio logica* only. The notions were expressed in the Greek terms *περιχώρησις*, *οὐσία*, *ὁμοουσιότης*, or *ὁμοουσία*. In like manner the *distinctions* between the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, were represented by the term *ὑπόστασις*, of which there are three in the *οὐσία*, *ὁμοουσία*, or *περιχώρησις*. These terms are but imperfectly represented by the Latin words *substantia* and *persona*, and still more by our English words *substance* and *person*.

Augustine strongly felt, as he has majestically expressed, the

* Rom. i. 6, 7; viii. 28; 1 Cor. i. 1, 2, 9, 24; vii. 17; Gal. i. 15; 1 Pet. ii. 9; 2 Pet. i. 3; 2 Tim. i. 9; Heb. ix. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 10; 2 Cor. i. 12; 2 Thess. i. 12; 2 Cor. iv. 7; Eph. i. 19; iii. 7; 1 Cor. i. 18; Eph. vi. 10; 1 Thess. i. 5; Acts xx. 32; Jude 1; Heb. viii. 10; John vi. 65; Phil. i. 29; 1 Cor. iii. 7.

ineffableness of this great mystery: "Cum ergo quæritur quid tria, vel quid tres, conferimus nos ad inveniendum aliquod speciale vel generale nomen, quo complectamur hæc tria, neque occurrit animo, quia excedit, supereminentia divinitatis usitati eloquii facultatem. Verius enim cogitatur Deus quam dicitur, et verius est quam cogitatur."*

"The word person (*persona*)," says Dr. Wallis, "is originally a Latin word, and doth not properly signify a man; (so that *another person* must needs imply *another man*,) for then the word *homo* would have served, and they needed not to have taken the word *persona*; but rather, one so circumstantiated. And the same *man*, if considered in other circumstances, (considerably different) is reputed *another person*. And that this is the true notion of the word *person* appears by those noted phrases *personam induere*, *personam deponere*, *personam agere*, and many the like, in approved Latin authors. Thus the same man may at once sustain the person of a king and a father, if he be invested both with *regal* and *paternal* authority. Now because the king and the father are for the most part, not only different persons, but different men also, (and the like in other cases) hence it comes to pass that *another person* is supposed to imply *another man*, but not always, nor is that the proper sense of the word. It is Englished in our dictionaries by the *state*, *quality*, or *condition wherein one man differs from another*; and so as the condition alters, the person alters, though the man be the same.

"The hinge of the controversy is—that notion concerning the *three somewhats*, which the Fathers (who first used it) did intend to design by the name person; so that we are not from the word person to determine what was that *notion*; but from the notion which they would express, to determine in what sense the word person is here used."†

Dr. Wallis' views of the Trinity, like those of Dr. South, border on Sabellianism.

"Concerning this most excellent and holy Trinity, *we cannot find any suitable words* in which we might speak of it, and yet we must express this supernatural, incomprehensible Trinity in words. If we therefore attempt to speak of it, it is

* De Trinitate, Lib. vii.

† Wallis' Letters on the Trinity. See on the same subject—Burton's Bampton Lectures; and Hampden's Bampton Lectures.

as impossible to do it properly as to reach the sky with one's head. For all that we can say or think of it is a thousand times less proportionate to it than the point of a needle is to heaven and earth, yea, a hundred thousand times less. We might talk to a wonderful amount, and yet we could neither express nor understand how the distinction of the persons can exist in the supernatural unity. It is better to meditate on these things than to speak of them; for it is not very pleasant either to say much about this matter, or to hear of it, especially when words have been introduced (from without), and because we are altogether unequal to the task. For the whole subject is at an infinite distance from us, and wholly foreign to us, nor is it revealed to us, for it even surpasses the apprehension of angels. We therefore leave it to our great prelates and learned men; they must have something to say, in order to defend the catholic faith; but we will simply believe."*

Tauler's sermons were greatly admired and much studied by Luther. In a letter to Spaladin the Reformer says: "If you delight in reading pure, solid, and ancient-like theology, poured out in the German tongue, you can procure the sermons of John Tauler, a preacher by profession. Neither in Latin, nor in our own tongue, have I met with theology more sound, and more in harmony with the Evangelists."

At another time he says: "I know, indeed, that this doctor is unknown to the schools of theologians, and for that reason, perhaps, is contemptible; but I have found in him (though all his writings are in the vernacular German) more solid and pure theology than is found, or ever can be found, in all the scholastic doctors of all the Universities."†

The following extract will probably be new to many of the readers of this Note. "In his (Dr. Samuel Clarke's) celebrated work *The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, he propounded his system with great clearness, and supported it with considerable strength and subtlety of argument. He met a powerful opponent in Doctor Hawarden, a celebrated clergyman of the Roman Catholic church. By the desire of Queen Caroline, the consort of George I., a conference was held by them, in the presence of her Majesty, of Mrs. Middleton, a Roman Catholic

* J. Tauleri Predigten. 4 vol. Berlin. 1841. pp. 172.

† Lutheri op. Tom. I. Epis. 23 ad Spal. 1516. p. 32. Id. p. 36.

lady, much in her confidence, and the celebrated Doctor Courayer.

“When they met, Doctor Clarke, at some length, in very guarded terms, and with great apparent perspicuity, exposed his system. After he had finished, a pause of some length ensued: Doctor Hawarden then said, that ‘he had listened, with the greatest attention, to what had been said by Doctor Clarke; that he believed he apprehended rightly the whole of his system; and that the only reply which he should make to it, was, asking a single question:’ that, ‘if the question should be thought to contain any ambiguity, he wished it to be cleared of its ambiguity before an answer to it should be given;’ but he desired that, ‘when the answer to it should be given, it should be expressed either by the affirmative or negative monosyllable.’ To this proposition Doctor Clarke assented. ‘Then,’ said Doctor Hawarden, ‘I ask, can God the Father annihilate the Son and the Holy Ghost? Answer me Yes or No.’ Doctor Clarke continued for some time in deep thought, and then said, ‘It was a question which he had never considered.’ Here the conference ended. A searching question it certainly was; and the reader will readily perceive its bearings. If Doctor Clarke answered—Yes, he admitted the Son and the Holy Ghost to be mere creatures; if he answered—No, he admitted them to be absolutely Gods. The writer of these pages has frequently heard the conference thus related, particularly by the late Mr. Alban Butler, the president of the English College at St. Omers, and Mr. Winstanly, the professor of Philosophy at the English College at Doway. It gave rise to Doctor Hawarden’s *Answer to Dr. Clarke and Mr. Whiston, concerning the Divinity of the Son of God, and of the Holy Spirit; with a Summary Account of the Writers of the Three First Ages.*” *An Historical and Literary Account of the Formularies, Confessions of Faith, or Symbolic Books, of the Roman Catholic, Greek, and principal Protestant Churches.* By the Author of the *Horæ Biblicæ.* pp. 65, 66.

F. (page 101.)

The writings of Mr. Thomas Carlyle are too well known to require that I should here point out certain tendencies in some

of them to follow a modern school of Germany in *generalizing the doctrine of Inspiration*. The same tendency is likewise apparent in the writings of Mr. Waldo Emerson, to which greater attention has been awakened here, since his recent visit to this country as a public lecturer. Frequent references are made, in more private circles, to the work of Mr. Theodore Parker, from which some expressions have been cited in the Lecture to which this note is appended. The theory *implied* rather than enounced, by these able and interesting writers, has long been familiar in Germany as one part of the Anti-Supranaturalism which has so extensively prevailed among speculative theologians of that country.

The English reader finds the root of this system in Toland's "Amyntor;" in Tindal's "Christianity as old as the Creation," 1730, *translated into German*, and published at Frankfort and Leipzig in 1741; and in Antony Collins' "Discourse of Free Thinking;" while answers to the theory are given in Simon Brown's, Coneybeare's, and Clarke's "Defences of Revealed Religion;" Arthur Young's "Historical Dissertations," and in Clarke's Tract "Some Reflexions;" Stephen Nye's "Historical Account of the contents of the New Testament;" Richardson's "Cause of the New Testament vindicated;" Jones on the Canon; and Lardner's "Credibility." It is presumed that the professed theologians of England are likewise familiar with the examinations published by the Swiss divines—Francis Turretin, and Stapfer.

Stripped of the poetry and mysticism with which modern German, English, and American, writers have clothed it, this system is neither more nor less than *Infidelity thinly veiled under the name and form of Christianity*. It is the denial of that which Christians, *as Christians*, believe—the denial of the facts which are peculiar to Christianity, and on which its speculative doctrines, its moral requirements, its permanent institutions, and its sublime hopes, are grounded. "The historical basis of popular doctrine, such as depravity, redemption, resurrection, the incarnation, is it formed of facts or no facts? Who shall tell us? Do not the wise men look after these things? One must needs blush for the patience of mankind. But has religion only *the bubble* of tradition to rest on; no other sanction than authority; no substance but belief? They

know little of the matter who say it. Did religion begin with *what we call* Christianity? Were there no saints before Peter? Religion is the first thing man learned; the last thing he will abandon. There is but one religion, as one ocean, though we call it faith in our church, and infidelity out of our church.”* “If one were to look at the evidence in favour of the Christian miracles, and proceed with the caution of a true inquirer, he must come to the conclusion, I think, that *they cannot be admitted as facts*. The resurrection, a miracle alleged to be wrought *upon* Jesus, and *not by* him—has more evidence than any other, for it is attested by the epistles, as well as by the gospels, and was one corner-stone of the Christian church. But here—is the testimony sufficient to show that a man thoroughly dead as Abraham and Isaac were, came back to life, passed through closed doors, and ascended into the sky? I cannot speak for others, but *most certainly*, I cannot believe *such facts*, on such evidence.”†

Unhappily it is no new thing for able and accomplished men to avow, as Mr. Parker does, that *they do not believe the Gospel*; but it is comparatively a new thing for men professedly teaching the Christian religion, to employ their knowledge, their genius, and their influence, for the undermining of our faith in the Gospel. Of such it may be said in the language of Augustine, “*quærunt non ut fidem, sed ut infidelitatem, inveniant.*”

The Anti-Supranatural theory has been revived in Germany by the disciples of Kant's and of Hegel's ideal philosophy. Instead of totally rejecting the Biblical narratives, some *bring a meaning to them*, explaining them, not by the laws of historical and philological criticism, but according to their preconceived philosophy; others represent them as accommodations to prevalent notions; others again treat them as the mythical costume of abstract ideas.

By such processes, men have naturally been prepared entirely to reject every statement of fact in the Scriptures which is miraculous or inexplicable by the *known* laws of nature. Men of *at least* equal learning and acuteness, however, have vindicated the historical truthfulness of the whole Bible, and have

* Theodore Parker's Discourse on Religion. Introduction, page 6.

† Idem, p. 208.

contended, successfully, as we think, for the sufficiency of the evidence on which Christians rest their belief in miracles and in inspiration.

A similar course is likely enough to be repeated in England. If, on the one hand, there are those who eagerly catch at this new form of attack on our religion, and are carried away by its specious explanations, others are not wanting who can meet them, and, by opposing the principles of history, of language, and of human experience, to the subtleties of logic or the ingenuities of imagination, can lay bare their sophistry and hollowness.

The remedy is not far to seek. Let the New Testament be candidly examined, as embodying the popular preaching of eye-witnesses, who sacrificed every worldly advantage, and life itself, as the pledge of their honesty; let it be considered whether *they* betray any signs of incompetency to judge of plain matters of fact; let it be explained how it came to pass that they prevailed on others to believe them, and that thus was introduced to the world the only religion that has ever honoured God, or met the wants of man; let the harmony of the facts, the miraculous facts, with the doctrines, and of the doctrines with the ethics, of the New Testament be well considered; and then it may be left to *sound reasoners* to judge whether that philosophy is worth anything which can be built up only on the ruins of Christianity. It is only they who are not well grounded in the mental laws by which men distinguish history from fiction, or who have some motive, conscious or undetected, different from the love of truth established by appropriate evidence, that are likely to be seduced by the writings to which I have now referred. It is greatly to be wished, for their sakes, that some of our English writers, well versed in the theological literature both of Germany and of England, would lucidly explain, and calmly discuss, all the questions relating to the real worth of historical Christianity, its proofs, and its connexion with doctrinal truths, and with the practical fruits of true religion.

Were it not invidious, perhaps presumptuous, I could mention the names of writers by whom such a work could be done, and done well: these suggestions are now made in the hope of calling *their* attention to it. "Every particle of the German

infidelity must be scattered to the winds, when it is proved that Jesus rose from the dead. We fail, or delay to convince ourselves on this capital point; because the men who will neither ingenuously deny it, nor candidly admit it, are able to entertain us with a thousand felicitous elucidations of the evangelical records, such as we had not dreamed of." *

The author here cited, has treated this topic in his own admirable style, in the first of his "Four Lectures on Spiritual Christianity." The expansion of the lucid arguments and beautiful illustrations of that Lecture, or something of the same character, embodying the results of much reading and thought in popular language, and in a devout spirit, may not improperly be added to the very long list of *desiderata* in our English religious literature.

Since the above Note was written, I have read Mr. Morell's volume on The Philosophy of Religion. His chapter on Inspiration is of a totally different character from that of the works above referred to. He regards "Inspiration" as "that special influence wrought upon the faculties (of a man,) by virtue of which he is able to grasp their realities in their perfect fulness and integrity," as "indicating the elevation of the religious consciousness, and with it, of course, the power of spiritual vision, to an intensity peculiar to the individual thus highly favoured by God,"—as "being in no sense *mechanical*, but purely *dynamical*: involving, not a novel and supernatural faculty, but a faculty already enjoyed, elevated *supernaturally* to an extraordinary power and susceptibility; indicating, in fact, an inward nature so perfectly harmonized to the Divine, so freed from the distorting influences of prejudice, passion, and sin, so simply recipient of the Divine ideas circumambient around it, so responsive in all its strings to the breath of heaven, that truth leaves an impress upon it which perfectly answers to its reality objective." In the development of the theory which he holds on the nature of inspiration, he dwells on numerous facts which are not to be denied, and which must be kept in view by all who would reason soundly on this interesting question. It would be a gross misrepresentation of Mr. Morell's views to say, that he loses sight of "the heavenly origin" of the in-

* Saturday Evening, Chap. vii. p. 126.

spiration enjoyed by prophets and apostles, or of "the supernatural agency" by which it was produced. Whether he is correct or not in his philosophy of inspiration, is a question to which my present theme does not require me to advert: yet I may be allowed to suggest to any persons who may be startled by its novelty *to them*, that they are scarcely competent to form an independent judgment on that subject until they have compared it with earlier discussions, and until they have fully mastered the distinction between the *supernatural* and the *natural*, both of which elements are assumed, alike, by the writers whom Mr. Morell follows, and by those from whom he dissents.

On the general contents of Mr. Morell's book, the bearing of considerable portions of his argument, and indeed of his whole purpose, on the subject of these Lectures, seems to require from me more than this passing reference to the particular question of inspiration.

I may, therefore, be allowed to say here, that I would earnestly commend the "Philosophy of Religion" to the candid and discriminating study of all those persons—not few, I hope—who desire to understand the way in which religion is viewed by some of the most thoughtful and religious minds in the present day.

At all times there have been those who entertained substantially all the views so lucidly and temperately advocated by this writer; and I am thoroughly persuaded that a strong exhibition of the vital and spiritual Christianity which it is so manifestly his aim to call forth, is felt by the most thoughtful believers of the Gospel among ourselves, in England here, as well as by the holiest men in Germany, to be the very chief of the many wants of the age in which we are living.

If it were correct to understand Mr. Morell as meaning that *the Spiritual life is already in every man*, and needs only to be developed by the truths of the Gospel, and by the fellowship of the church, it will be seen that my view differs from his; inasmuch as I believe that the inspired writers teach us to look for another power, *not naturally in ourselves*, for the original production, and the constant quickening of that life which, when so produced and quickened, unfolds itself in the manner which is so beautifully elucidated in his pages. But I am far from affirming that Mr. Morell, if he were discussing the questions

which I have handled, would bring out results essentially different from those which I have expounded.

G. (page 175.)

The following passages may set this doctrine in a light which not a few honest men on opposite sides have probably not fully considered.

Licet autem voces *resistibilitas* et *irresistibilitas* gratiæ et barbaræ sunt, et minus aptæ ad id quod quæritur explicandum: ipsis enim resistibile dicitur quod potest impediri; cum tamen aliud sit resistere, aliud superare. Cogimur iis uti *ad hominem*.—Inst. Theo. F. Turretini. P. II. Loc. xv. Quæst. vi. sec. 3.

Observandum hic primo: Male explicari Reformatorum sententiam de *resistibilitate* vel *irresistibilitate* gratiæ de ejus *efficacia* vel *inefficacia* quando ipsis tribuitur; (a) Negare eos gratiæ resistibilitatem respectu naturæ corruptæ et carnis Deo immicæ quæ, quantum in se est omnino resistit; vel respectu gratiæ externæ vocantis et prævenientis, cui homines resistere quotidiana testantur exempla; vel denique, ratione gratiæ internæ et efficacis cui *ab initio* natura resistit, ultimo tamen et finaliter à gratia superatur, et caro à Spiritu vincitur. (b) Falso etiam Reformatis a nonnullis tribuitur—ipsos per insuperabilem gratiæ efficaciam motionem violentam ac coactam intelligere, qualis trunci vel lapidis est.—Inst. Theol. Polem. T. F. Stapferi. Tom. v. c. xx. sect. 108.

“The great point of controversy really is, what is it that determines, disposes, and decides the matter—whether there shall be saving virtue in the heart or not—and, much more properly, whether the grace of God in the affair be *determining* grace, than whether it be irresistible.”—Remarks on Important Theological Controversies, by President Edwards. Chap. iv. sect. 47.

“It may be allowed that God acts as a Sovereign in convincing some souls of sin, arresting them in their mad career by his *resistless* power. It seems, also, that, at the moment of our conversion he acts irresistibly.”—On the Sovereignty of God.—Wesley’s Works, (1830) vol. 10.

Sowie die Begründung des Heils in der Person des Erlösers nicht zauberisch, sondern, indem sie sich zunächst der Lehre und des Zeugnisses bedient, in Gemäßheit des menschlichen Grundverhältnisses verfährt, welches die Freiheit in sich schließt: so muß die Aneignung des Heils gleichfalls zuvörderst darauf wirken, daß die freie Empfänglichkeit des Menschen angeregt oder hervorgerufen werde. Diese Vermittlung der Gnadenwirkung durch Wort, Kirche und Sacrament, schließt das Bedürfnis eines unmittelbaren Werkes Gottes am menschlichen Herzen nicht aus, und der Anfang der Wiedergeburt aus dem Geist, wo er wirklich statt gefunden, hindert nicht, daß es eine immerwährende Fortsetzung desselben bis zu einem Ende gebe, welches in dem gegenwärtigen Zustande der Menschheit niemals abzusehen ist. Diesem dreifachen Verhältnisse entsprechen die drei Lehrstücke von der Berufung des Sünders durch das Evangelium, von der Wiedergeburt aus dem Geist, und von der Heiligung des menschlichen Lebens."—System der Christlichen Lehre von Dr. Carl Immanuel Nitzsch.* (4th Edit. 1839.) Sec. 141. See also Sec. 145.

"As the grounding of salvation in the Redeemer's person does not destroy the freedom of human agency, the experience of salvation, in like manner, calls that free agency forth. This mediate work of grace through the word, the church, and the sacraments, does not supersede the necessity of an immediate work of God on the human heart: and the beginning of the new birth by the Spirit, where it actually takes place, is of such a nature as to admit of the incessant operation of the same power for the attainment of an end which is never realized in the present condition of mankind. To this threefold relation there is a correspondence in the three distinct doctrines—of the calling of the sinner by the Gospel,—of the new birth by the Spirit,—and of the holiness of the human life.

Observation. It always appears to us that the attempt to give psychological analysis of the work of grace fails to secure the end in view: on the one hand, the Divine act, and on the other, the subjective change, is too strongly distinguished. Even if this were admissible, the phraseology of the Bible has little correspondence with such a distinction. And how can we,

* There is an interesting account of Dr. Nitzsch in the Biblical Review for April, 1849.

by this method, either avoid the false theory of the Synergists, or place in the true light the essential and free self-agency of man?"

H. (page 183.)

. . . . "How came matter to have such properties and laws? Are these also to be considered as things of selection and institution? And if so, can we trace the reasons why the laws were established in their present form; why the properties which matter actually possesses were established and bestowed upon it? We have already attempted, in a previous part of this work, to point out some of the advantages which are secured by the existing laws of heat, light, and moisture; can we, in the same manner, point out the benefits which arise from the present constitution of those laws of matter which are mainly concerned in the production of cosmical phenomena?

It will readily be perceived that the discussion of this point must necessarily require some effort of abstract thought. The laws and properties of which we have here to speak—the laws of motion and the universal properties of matter—are so closely interwoven with our conceptions of the external world, that we have great difficulty in conceiving them not to exist, or to exist other than they are. When we press or lift a stone, we can hardly imagine that it could, by possibility, do otherwise than resist our effort by its hardness and by its heaviness, qualities so familiar to us: when we throw it, it seems inevitable that its motion should depend on the impulse we give, just as we find that it invariably does.

Nor is it easy to say *how far* it is really possible to suppose the fundamental attributes of matter to be different from what they are. If we, in our thoughts, attempt to divest matter of its powers of resisting and moving, it ceases to be matter, according to our conceptions, and we can no longer reason upon it with any distinctness. And yet it is certain that we can conceive the laws of hardness and weight and motion to be quite different from what they are, and can point out some of the consequences which would result from such difference. The properties of matter, even the most fundamental and universal

ones, do not obtain by an absolute necessity, resembling that which belongs to the properties of geometry. A line touching a circle is *necessarily* perpendicular to a line drawn to the centre through the point touched; for it may be shown that the contrary involves a contradiction; but there is no contradiction in supposing that a body's motion should naturally diminish, or that its weight should increase in removing further from the earth's centre.

Thus the properties of matter and the laws of motion are what we find them, not by virtue of any internal necessity which we can understand. The studies of such laws and properties may, therefore, disclose to us the character of that external agency by which we conceive them to have been determined to be what they are; and this must be the same agency by which all other parts of the constitution of the universe were appointed and ordered.

But we can hardly expect, with regard to such subjects, that we shall be able to obtain any complete or adequate view of the reasons why these general laws are so selected and so established. These laws are the universal basis of all operations which go on, at any moment, in every part of space, with regard to every particle of matter, organic and inorganic. All other laws and properties must have a reference to these, and must be influenced by them, both such as men have already discovered, and the far greater number which remain still unknown. The general economy and mutual relations of all parts of the universe must be subordinate to the laws of motion and matter of which we here speak. We can easily suppose that the various processes of nature, and the dependences of various creatures, are affected in the most comprehensive manner by these laws;—are simplified by *their* simplicity, made consistent by *their* universality; rendered regular by *their* symmetry. We can easily suppose that in this way there may be the most profound and admirable reasons for the existence of the present universal properties of matter, which we cannot apprehend in consequence of the limited nature of our knowledge and of our faculties. For, though our knowledge on certain subjects, and to a certain extent, is positive and clear; compared with the whole extent of the universe, the whole aggregate of things, and relations, and connexions which exist, it is most narrow and partial, most

shallow and superficial. We cannot suppose, therefore, that the reasons which we discover for the present form of the laws of nature go nearly to the full extent, or to the bottom of the reasons, which a more complete and profound insight would enable us to perceive. To do justice to such reasons, would require nothing less than a perfect acquaintance with the whole constitution of every part of creation; a knowledge which man has not, and, so far as we can conceive, never can have.

We are certain, therefore, that our views, with regard to this part of our subject, must be imperfect and limited. Yet still man has *some* knowledge with regard to various portions of nature; and with regard to those most general and comparatively simple facts to which we now refer, his knowledge is more comprehensive, and goes deeper than it does in any other province. We conceive, therefore, that we shall not be engaged in any rash or presumptuous attempt, if we endeavour to point out some of the advantages which are secured by the present constitution of some of the general mechanical laws of nature; and to suggest the persuasion of that purpose and wise design, which the selection of such laws will thus appear to imply."—Whewell's *Bridgewater Treatise, on Astronomy and General Physics*. Book II. chap. ix. Mechanical Laws.

I. (pages 192—195.)

ΣΩ. Αἰσθάνει δὲ νῦν πῶς ἔχεις ; ἐλευθεροπρεπῶς ἢ οὐ ;

ΑΛ. Δοκῶ μοι καὶ μάλα σφόδρα αἰσθάνεσθαι.

ΣΩ. Οἶσθα οὖν πῶς ἀποφεύξει τοῦτο τὸ περὶ σὲ νῦν ; ἵνα μὴ ὀνομάζωμεν αὐτὸ ἐπὶ καλῷ ἀνδρί.

ΑΛ. Ἐγωγε.

ΣΩ. Πῶς ;

ΑΛ. Ἐὰν βούλη συ, ὦ Σώκρατες.

ΣΩ. Οὐ καλῶς λεγεις, ὦ Ἀλκιβιάδης.

ΑΛ. Ἀλλὰ πῶς χρη λέγειν ;

ΣΩ. Ὅτι ἐὰν θεὸς ἐθέλῃ.

Plato Alcib. i. vol. vi. p. 134, 5.

Ἦν τοίνυν ἔθεμεν τοῦ φιλοσόφου φύσιν, ἂν μὲν, οἶμαι, μαθήσεως προσηκούσης τύχῃ, εἰς πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν ἀνάγκη αὐξανομένην ἀφικνεῖσθαι, ἐὰν δὲ

μή ἐν προσηκούσῃ σπαρείσά τε καὶ φυτευθεῖσα τρέφῃται, εἰς πάν τα τάναντία αὖ, ἐὰν μή τις αὐτῇ βοηθήσας θεῶν τύχη.

Plato Polit. vol. vii. p. 14.

ΣΩ. . . . ἀναγκαῖον οὖν ἐστὶ περιμένειν ἕως ἄν τις μάθῃ ὡς δεῖ πρὸς θεοὺς καὶ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους διακεῖσθαι.

ΑΛ. Πότε οὖν παρέσται ὁ χρόνος οὗτος, ὃ Σώκρατες; καὶ τίς ὁ παι-
δεύσων; ἥδιστα γὰρ ἂν μοι δοκῶ ἰδεῖν τοῦτον τὸν ἀνθρώπον τίς ἐστιν.

ΣΩ. Οὗτός ἐστιν ᾧ μέλει περὶ σοῦ· ἀλλὰ δοκεῖ μοι, ὥς περ τῷ Διομήδει φησὶ τὴν. Ἀθηναῖν Ὅμηρος ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἀφελεῖν τὴν ἀχλὺν, ὅφρ' εὖ γινώσκοι ἡμὲν θεὸν ἡδέ καὶ ἄνδρα, οὕτω καὶ σοὶ δεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς ψυχῆς πρῶτον τὴν ἀχλὺν ἀφελόντα, ἣ νῦν παροῦσα τυγχάνει, τὸ τηνικαυτ' ἥδη προσφέρειν δι' ὧν μέλλεις γνῶσεσθαι ἡμὲν κακὸν ἡδὲ καὶ ἐσθλόν. νῦν μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ἂν μοι δοκεῖς δυνηθῆναι.

ΑΛ. Ἀφαιρείτω, εἴτε βούλεται τὴν ἀχλὺν εἴτε ἄλλο τι. ὥς ἐγὼ παρε-
σκεύασμαι μηδὲν ἂν φυγεῖν τῶν ὑπ' ἐκείνου προσταττομένων, ὅς τις ποτ'
ἐστὶν ὁ ἀνθρώπος, εἴ γε μελλοίμι βελτιῶν γενέσθαι.

ΣΩ. Ἀλλὰ μὴν κάκείνος θαυμαστὴν ὄσσην περὶ σέ προθυμίαν ἔχει.

Plato Alcib. ii. vol. iii. p. 124, 5.

. . . . ὁ δέ τις ἐξαρθεὶς ὑπὸ μεγαλαυχίας ἢ χρήμασιν ἐπαιρόμενος ἢ τιμαῖς ἢ καὶ σώματος εὐμόρφίᾳ, ἅμα νεότητι καὶ ἀνοίᾳ, φλέγεται τὴν ψυχὴν μεθ' ὕβρεως, ὡς οὗτ' ἄρχοντας οὗ τέ τινος ἡγεμόνος δεόμενος ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλοις ἱκανὸς ὧν ἡγέισθαι, καταλείπεται ἔρημος θεοῦ, καταλειφθεὶς δὲ καὶ ἔτι ἄλλους τοιοῦτους πρὸς λαβῶν σκιρτᾷ ταραττων πάνθ' ἅμα, καὶ πολλοῖς τισὶν ἔδοξεν εἶναί τις, μετὰ δὲ χρόνον οὐ πολὺν ὑποσχὼν τιμωρίαν οὐ μεμπτήν τῇ δίκῃ ἑαυτὸν τε καὶ οἶκον καὶ πόλιν ἄρδην ἀνάστατον ἐποίησε.

Plato Leg. vol. viii. p. 113.

“The object of inquiry is, what is the principle of motion in the soul. It is plain then that as God is in the universe, so everything is in Him; for the divinity within us in a manner moves all things. But the principle of reason is not reason, but something superior. What then can one say is superior even to science, but God? for virtue is an instrument of the intellect. On this account also the ancients said: they are called fortunate who have an impulse to succeed, being themselves without reason; and willing is not expedient for them; for they have a principle of a nature superior to intellect and will. But there are some that have reason, and not this: and these are enthusiasms; but these have not the power of

this: for as being unreasonable they fail It is evident then that there are two kinds of good fortune: one divine, whence also the fortunate seems to succeed through God; this is the character that is apt to do right through impulse: the other one who does right against impulse."

Aristot. Eth. Eudem. lib. vii. c. 14, tom. ii. p. 289, Du Val. Quoted by Dr. Hampden, Bishop of Hereford, in Note C. to the sixth lecture on the Scholastic Philosophy. 3rd edition. 1848.

Facis rem optimam, et tibi salutarem, si, ut scribis, perseveras ire ad bonam mentem; quam stultum est optare, cum possis à te impetrare. Non sunt ad cœlum elevandæ manus, nec exorandus ædituus, ut nos ad aures simulacri, quasi magis exaudiri possimus, admittat: prope est à te Deus, tecum est, intus est. Ita dico, Lucili, sacer intra nos spiritus sedet malorum bonorumque nostrorum observator et custos; hic prout à nobis tractatus est, ita nos ipse tractat. Bonus vir sine Deo nemo est. An potest aliquis supra fortunam, nisi ab illo adjutus, exsurgere? ille dat consilia magnifica, et erecta. In uno quoque virorum bonorum (quis Deus incertum est) habitat Deus.

L. Annæi Senecæ Philosophi. Tom. Sec. Ep. 41.

. . . . ὥστε ὅσον ἐπὶ τοῖς θεοῖς, καὶ ταῖς ἐκείθεν διαδόσεσι καὶ συλλήψεσι, καὶ ἐπινοίαις, μηδὲν κωλύειν ἤδη κατα φύσιν ζῆν με, ἢ ἀπολείπεσθαι ἔτι τούτου παρὰ τὴν ἐμὴν αἰτίαν, καὶ παρὰ τὸ μὴ διατηρεῖν τὰς ἐκ των θεῶν ὑπομνήσεις, καὶ μονονουχὶ διδασκαλίας.

Marci Antonini De Rebus Suis. Lib. i. sec. 17.

Ed. Gatakeri, 1697.

K. (page 197.)

Besides referring in general terms to the constant maintenance of this vital doctrine in all ages, let me request the studious reader to consult the original Church Histories; Cave's *Historia Literaria*—Dupin's *New Ecclesiastical History*—Tillemont's *Mémoires*, and the modern writers, such as Guerike, Gieseler, and especially Neander.

In addition to Church Histories, it will be advantageous to examine some of the more recent Histories of Doctrine, such as Bretschneider, Hase, or Hagenbach.

The ancient liturgies will be found in the best English libraries: there is a fine collection, which I have seen, at St. Mary's College, Oscott, near Birmingham.

The following specimens of prayers and hymns exhibit the current sentiments of the devout from an early period.

AD SPIRITUM SANCTUM.

Divini amor numinis, Patris Omnipotentis, prolisque beatissimæ sancta communicatio, Omnipotens paraclete Spiritus, merentium Consolator clementissime, jam cordis mei penetrabilibus potenti illabere virtute, et tenebrosa quæque laris neglecti latibula, corusci luminis fulgore pius habitator lætifica, tuique roris abundantia longo ariditatis marcentia squalore visitando fœcunda. Saucia interioris hominis arcana, tui amoris jaculo, et torpentis medullas jecoris flammis salutaribus penetrando succende, sanctique fervoris igne illustrando intima mentis, et corporis universa depasce. Pota me torrente voluptatis tuæ, ut nihil jam mundanorum degustare libeat, venenate dulcedinis. Judica me Domine et discerne causam meam, de gente non sancta, doce me facere voluntatem tuam, quia Deus meus es tu. Credo ergo, quod quemcunque inhabitaveris, Patris ac pariter Filii domicilium condis. Beatus qui te merebitur hospitari, quoniam per te, Pater et Filius apud eum faciunt mansionem. Veni jam veni benignissime dolentis animæ consolator, protegens in opportunitatibus, in tribulatione adjutor. Veni mundator scelerum, curator vulnerum. Veni fortitudo fragilium, revelator labentium. Veni humilium doctor, superbiorum destructor. Veni orphanorum pius Pater, viduarum dulcis judex. Veni spes pauperum, refocillator deficientium. Veni navigantium sidus, naufragii portus. Veni omnium viventium singulare decus, morientium unica salus. Veni sanctissime Spiritus, veni et miserere mei, apta me tibi, et condescende propitius mihi, ut mea tuæ magnitudini exiguitas, roborique tuo mea imbecillitas, secundum multitudinem tuarum complaceat miserationum, per Jesum Christum Salvatorem meum, qui cum Patre in tua unitate vivit, et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

AUGUST. SOLILOQ. CAP. 33.

Cognovi te Deum, et unum Spiritum S. Patris et Filii, ab utroque pariter procedentem, consubstantialem et coæternum

Patri et Filio, Paracletum et advocatum nostrum, qui super eundem Deum Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum in columbæ specie descendisti, et super Apostolos in linguis igneis apparuisti, qui et omnes sanctos et electos Dei à principio tuæ gratiæ munere docuisti, et ora Prophetarum, ut enarrent mirabilia regni tui aperuisti, quia ab omnibus sanctis Dei, cum Patre et Filio, simul adoraris et glorificaris, inter quos et ego filius ancillæ tuæ, toto corde meo glorifico nomen tuum, quoniam illuminasti me. Tu enim es vera lux, lumen veridicum, ignis Dei, et Magister Spirituum, qui unctione tua doces nos omnem veritatem, Spiritus veritatis, sine quo impossibile est placere Deo, quoniam tu ipse Deus es ex Deo, et lux de luce, procedens à patre luminum, et à suo Filio Domino nostro Jesu Christo, quibus consubstantialis, et coæqualis, et coæternus existens, in unius Trinitatis essentia superessentialiter congloriaris, et conregnas in secula seculorum. Amen.

ECCLESIA.

Domine Spiritus Sancte Deus, qui coæqualis, consubstantialis, et coæternus Patri, Filioque existens, ab eis ineffabiliter procedens, quique super eundem Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum in columbæ specie apparuisti, et super sanctos discipulos in linguis igneis descendisti, tibi gratias ago, te adoro, te laudo, teque benedico et glorifico, repelle à me quæso tenebras totius iniquitatis et perfidiæ, ac accende in me lumen misericordiæ tuæ, et ignem sanctissimi amoris tui, qui vivis et regnas Deus, per omnia secula seculorum. Amen.

HYMNUS.

Sancti Spiritus adsit nobis gratia.
 Quæ corda nostra sibi faciat habitaculum.
 Expulsis inde cunctis vitiis spiritualibus.
 Spiritus alme illustrator hominum,
 Horridas nostræ mentis purga tenebras.
 Amator sancte sensatorum, semper cogitatum,
 Infunde unctionem tuam clemens nostris sensibus.
 Tu purificator omnium flagitiorum Spiritus,
 Purifica nostri oculum interioris hominis
 Ut videri supremus genitor possit à nobis;
 Mundi cordis, quem soli cernere possunt oculi.

Prophetis tu inspirasti, ut præconia Christi præcINUissent
inELYta.

Apostolos confortasti, ut trophœum Christi per totum mundum
veherent.

Quando machinam per verbum suum fecit Deus cœli, terræ,
marium.

Tu super aquas solutus eas, nomen tuum expandisti Spiritus.

Tu animabus vivificandis aquas fœcundas.

Tu aspirando das spirituales esse homines.

Tu divisum per linguas mundum et ritus, adunasti Domine.

Idolatrias ad cultum Dei revocas magistrorum optime,

Ergo nos supplicantes tibi exaudi Sancte Spiritus.

Sine quo preces omnes cassæ creduntur, et indignæ auribus.

Tu qui omnium seculorum sanctos tui nominis docuisti in-
stinctu amplectendo Spiritus.

Ipse hodie Apostolos Christi donans munere insolito, et cunc-
tis inaudito seculis.

Hunc diem gloriosum fecisti.

HYMNUS.

Veni sancte Spiritus, et emitte cœlitus lucis tuæ radium.

Veni Pater pauperum, veni dator munerum, veni lumen cor-
dium.

Consolator optime, dulcis hospes animæ, dulce refrigerium.

In labore requies, in æstu temperies, in fletu solatium.

O lux beatissima, reple cordis intima tuorum fidelium.

Sine tuo numene nihil est in homine, nihil est innoxium.

Lava quod est sordidum, riga quod est aridum, sana quod est
saucium.

Flecte quod est rigidum, fove quod est aridum, rege quod est
devium.

Da tuis fidelibus, in te confidentibus, sacrum septenarium.

Da virtutis præmium da salutis exitum, da perenne gaudium.

HYMNUS.

Veni, Creator Spiritus,

Mentes tuorum visita,

Imple superna gratia

Quæ tu creasti pectora.

Qui paracletus diceris,

Donum Dei altissimi
Fons vivus, ignis, charitas,
Et spiritalis unctio.

Tu septiformis munere,
Dextræ Dei tu digitus,
Tu rite promissum Patris,
Sermone ditans guttura.

Accende lumen sensibus,
Infunde amorem cordibus,
Infirma nostri corporis
Virtute firmans perpetim.

Hostem repellas longius,
Pacemque dones protinus,
Ductore sic te prævio,
Vitemus omne noxium.

Per te sciamus da Patrem,
Noscamus atque Filium,
Te utriusque Spiritum,
Credamus omni tempore.

Sit laus Patri cum Filio,
Sancto simul Paracleta,
Nobisque mittat Filius,
Charisma Sancti Spiritus.

ORATIO.

Concede quæ sumus omnipotens Deus, ut qui solemnitatem
doni Spiritus Sancti colimus, cœlesti desiderio accensi fontem
vitæ sitiamus.

ALIA.

Præsta quæsumus omnipotens Deus, ut claritatis tuæ super
nos splendor effulgeat, et lux tuæ lucis corda eorum, qui per
gratiam tuam renati sunt, Sancti Spiritus illustratione confirmet,
Per eundem.

ALIA.

Deus, qui hodierna die corda fidelium, sancti Spiritus illus-
tratione docuisti, da nobis in eodem spiritu recta sapere, et de
ejus semper consolatione gaudere, Per eundem Dominum, &c.

ALIA.

Deus qui Apostolis tuis sanctum dedisti Spiritum, concede plebi tuæ piæ petitionis effectum. ut quibus dedisti fidem, largiaris et pacum, Per, &c.

ALIA.

Assit nobis, quæsumus Domine, virtus sancti Spiritus, qui et corda nostra clementer expurget, et ab omnibus tueatur adversis, Per eundem, &c.

ALIA.

Mentes nostras quæsumus, paracletus, qui à te procedit, illuminet, et inducat in omnem sicut tuus promisit Filius veritatem. Qui te in ejusdem, &c.

ALIA.

Præsta quæsumus omnipotens et misericors Deus, ut Spiritus Sanctus adveniens templum nos gloriæ suæ dignanter in habitando perficiat, Per eundem, &c.

ALIA.

Da quæsumus Ecclesia tuæ misericors Deus, ut Spiritus Sanctus congregata, hostili nullatenus incursione turbetur, Per, &c.

Precationes ex veteribus orthodoxes doctoribus, ex ecclesiæ hymnis et canticis, ex Psalmis demque Davidis: collectæ, recognitæ et auctæ, per Andreæ Musculum. D. Anno MDCX.

Translation of the preceding extracts from the Collection of Musculus.

TO THE HOLY SPIRIT.

O Love of the Divine Majesty, the Holy Communication of the Almighty Father, and of the most blessed Offspring, Omnipotent Spirit the Paraclete, the most merciful Comforter of the deserving, enter now into the depths of my heart by thy powerful virtue; and also, as the rightful inhabitant, gladden the gloomy recesses of the neglected dwelling by the effulgence of thy gleaming light; and the places withering through drought, in long continued barrenness, make fruitful by visiting them with the abundance of thine own dew. Wound the hidden parts of the inner man by the dart of thy love, and enkindle the inmost depths of my sluggish heart, by

penetrating them with thy healthful flames; and cause the inmost parts of the mind and the whole of the body to be eaten up by enlightening with the fire of holy fervour. Drench me with a torrent of thine own pleasure, so that to indulge in worldly things, in the poison of their sweetness, may no longer be pleasing to me. Judge me, O God, and decide my cause concerning an unholy nation; teach me to do thy will, for thou art my God. For I believe, that in whomsoever thou dost dwell, thou dost make a habitation equally for the Father and the Son. Blessed is he who shall be thought worthy to entertain thee, because through thee, the Father and the Son make their abode with him. Come now, O come, thou most benignant consoler of the sorrowing spirit, the protector in times of necessity, the supporter in tribulation. Come, cleanser of impurities—healer of wounds. Come, strength of the weak—revealer of passing events. Come, teacher of the humble—destroyer of the proud. Come, righteous father of orphans—kind judge of widows. Come, hope of the poor—reviver of the disheartened. Come, star of mariners—the refuge from shipwreck. Come, matchless grace of all living—the only safety of the dying. Come, O Most Holy Spirit, come and pity me; unite me to thyself, and condescend to be merciful to me, that my littleness may be pleasing to thy greatness, and my weakness to thy strength, according to the multitude of thy mercies, through Jesus Christ my Saviour, who with the Father in thy unity, liveth and reigneth through everlasting ages, Amen.

SOLILOQUY OF AUGUSTINE.

Chapter xxxiii.

I know thee, God, and one Holy Spirit, proceeding equally from both the Father and the Son, consubstantial and coeternal with the Father and the Son, our Paraclete and Advocate, who didst descend in the form of a dove upon the same God, our Lord Jesus Christ, and didst appear upon the apostles in tongues of fire, and hast taught all the holy and elect of God from the beginning by the gift of thy grace, and hast opened the mouths of prophets, that they should explain the wonders of thy kingdom, for which thou art adored and glorified by all the saints of God equally with the Father and the Son, with

whom, I also the son of thine handmaid will glorify thy name with all my heart, since thou hast enlightened me. For thou art the true light, the truth-speaking luminary, the fire of God, and spiritual instructor, who dost teach us all truth by thine unction, the Spirit of truth, without whom it is impossible to please God, since thou thyself art God from God, and light from light, proceeding from the Father of lights, and from his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, with whom thou dost exist consubstantial, and coequal, and coeternal, and art together praised superessentially in the essence of one Trinity, and co-reignest throughout all ages, Amen.

THE CONGREGATION.

O Lord God, the Holy Spirit, who dost exist coequal, consubstantial, and coeternal with the Father and the Son, proceeding ineffably from them, who didst appear upon our Lord Jesus Christ in the form of a dove, and who didst descend upon the holy disciples in tongues of fire, I render thanks to thee, I adore thee, I praise, and I bless and glorify thee. Remove from me, I pray, the darkness of all iniquity and faithlessness, and enkindle in me the light of thy mercy, and the fire of thy most holy love, who livest and reignest God, through all eternity, Amen.

A HYMN.

May the grace of the Holy Spirit be with us,
 Who makes our hearts his habitation,
 All spiritual evils being thence expelled.
 Beneficent Spirit, enlightener of men,
 Remove the dreadful darkness of our mind.
 Holy lover of the intelligent, of the ever thoughtful,
 Mercifully pour thine unction into our understandings.
 O thou Spirit, cleanser of all impurities,
 Purify the eye of our inner man,
 That the Supreme Father may be seen by us;
 Whom the eyes of a pure heart alone can see.
 Thou didst inspire the prophets that they should foretell the
 celebrated announcements of Christ.
 Thou didst strengthen the apostles that they should carry
 through all the world the victory of Christ.

When God by his word made the fabric of the heaven, the earth,
and the seas,
Thou over the unbounded waters, didst spread out thy name.
Thou makest the waters fruitful with life-endowed souls.
Thou, by breathing upon men, makest them to be spiritual.
Thou, O Lord, unitest the world, divided by language and
customs.
Thou, best of teachers, recallest idolaters to the worship of God.
Therefore, O Holy Spirit, hear us, as we supplicate thee,
Without whom all our prayers are believed to be useless, and not
worthy to be heard.
Thou Spirit who hast taught the saints of all ages, by laying
hold of them with the impulse of thy name.
Thou thyself until now bestowing upon the apostles of Christ a
gift, strange and unheard of throughout all ages,
Thou hast made this day glorious.

A HYMN.

Come, Holy Spirit, and send forth from heaven a ray of thy light.
Come, Father of the poor; come Bestower of gifts; come, Light
of hearts.
Best Comforter, sweet guest of the soul, sweet consolation,
Rest in labour, temperateness in heat, solace in weeping,
O most blessed light, fill the inmost depths of the heart of thy
faithful ones.
Without thy power there is nothing in man, nothing is innocent.
Cleanse that which is filthy; moisten that which is dry; heal
that which is wounded;
Bend that which is rigid; cherish that which is parched; direct
that which is deviating.
O Holy Seven! give thyself to thy faithful ones, who trust in thee;
Give the reward of virtue; give the fulfilment of salvation; give
perennial joy.

A HYMN.

Come, Creator, Spirit,
Visit the minds of thine own,
Fill with celestial grace
The souls which thou hast created.
Who art called the Paraclete,

Gift of the most High God,
Living fountain, fire, love,
And spiritual unction.

Thou sevenfold in office,
Thou, the finger of God's right hand,
Thou, in due form, the promise of the Father,
Enriching voices with speech.

Enkindle light in our understandings,
Pour love into our hearts,
The weaknesses of our body
Strengthen continually by thy virtue.

Drive far from us the enemy,
And speedily give us peace ;
So that thou going before us as our Leader,
We may avoid every hurtful thing.

Grant that through thee we may know the Father,
And also know the Son,
And the Spirit of both,
That at all times we may have confidence.

Praise be to the Father with the Son,
Together with the Holy Paraclete :
And may the Son send upon us
The grace of the Holy Spirit.

A PRAYER.

Grant, we beseech thee, Almighty God, that we who observe the celebration of the gift of the Holy Spirit, being fired with heavenly longing, may thirst after the fountain of life.

ANOTHER.

Grant, we beseech thee, Almighty God, that the refulgence of thy brightness may shine upon us, and that the light of thy light may strengthen the hearts of those who have been renewed by thy grace, through the enlightening of the Holy Spirit.

ANOTHER.

O God, who hast taught unto this day the hearts of the faithful, by the enlightening of the Holy Spirit ; give us to understand what is right by the same Spirit, and ever to rejoice in the same consolation.

ANOTHER.

O God, who didst give thy Holy Spirit to thine apostles, grant to thy people the accomplishment of their devout petition, that to whom thou hast given faith, thou wouldest also impart peace.

ANOTHER.

O Lord, we pray thee, let the power of thy Holy Spirit be with us, and that He may mercifully cleanse our hearts, and protect us from all our adversaries.

ANOTHER.

We pray that the Paraclete, who proceeds from thee, may enlighten our minds and lead us into all truth, as thy Son has promised.

ANOTHER.

Grant we beseech thee, Almighty and merciful God, that the Holy Spirit may come and perfect us as the temple of his glory, by worthily dwelling in us.

ANOTHER.

Grant to thy church, we beseech thee, O merciful God, O Holy Spirit, that, being assembled together, she may by no means be disturbed by hostile invasion.

L. (page 241.)

Οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῖν εὐηγγελίσθησαν ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ἐξεπέμφθη ὁ Χριστὸς οὖν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ· ἐγένοντο οὖν ἀμφοτέρα εὐτάκτως ἐκ θελήματος Θεοῦ. Παραγγελίας οὖν λαβόντες, καὶ πληροφορηθέντες διὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ πιστωθέντες ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, μετὰ πληροφορίας Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, ἐξῆλθον εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ μέλλειν ἔρχεσθαι. Κατὰ χώρας οὖν καὶ πύλεις κηρύσσοντες, καθέστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τῷ Πνεύματι, εἰς ἐπισκοποὺς καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν.

S. Clementis Epis. ad Corin. i. sec. 42.

Καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἔγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἔρις ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς. Διὰ ταύτην οὖν τὴν αἰτίαν πρόγνωσιν εἰληφότες τελείαν, κατέστησαν τοὺς προειρημένους, καὶ μεταξὺ ἐπινομήν δεδώκασιν, ὅπως εἰὰ κοιμηθῶσιν, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασ-

μένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν. Τοὺς οὖν κατασταθέντας ὑπ' ἐκείνων, ἢ μεταξὺ ὑφ' ἐτέρων ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν, συνευδοκησάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης, καὶ λειτουργήσαντας ἀμέμπτως τῷ ποιμνίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ ταπεινοφροσύνης, ἡσύχως καὶ ἀβαναύσως, μεμαρτυρημένους τε πολλοῖς χρόνοις ὑπὸ πάντων, τουτους οὐ δικαίως νομίζομεν ἀποβαλεσθαι τῆς λειτουργίας. Ἀμαρτία γὰρ οὐ μικρὰ ἡμῖν ἔσται, εἰὰν τοὺς ἀμέμπτως καὶ ὁσious προσενέγκοντας τὰ δῶρα, τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἀποβάλωμεν. Μακάριοι οἱ προοδοιπορήσαντες πρεσβύτεροι, οἵτινες ἔγκαρπον καὶ τελείαν ἔσχον τὴν ἀνάλυσιν· οὐ γὰρ εὐλαβοῦνται μή τις αὐτοὺς μεταστήσῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰδρυμένοι αὐτοῖς τόπου.

S. Clementis Epis. ad. Corin. 1 sec. 44.

M. (page 242.)

“This epistle, although genuine in the main, is still not exempt from important interpolations. We detect a palpable contradiction, when for example, we observe, gleaming through the surface of the whole epistle, the simple relations of the oldest constitution of the Christian Church, where bishops and presbyters were placed wholly on a level, and then in one passage, sec. 40 and onward, find the whole system of the Jewish priesthood transferred to the Christian Church. The epistle which passes under the name of the second, is manifestly nothing but the fragment of a homily.”

“Ignatius, bishop of the church at Antioch, is said, in the reign of Trajan, to have been conveyed as a prisoner to Rome, where he was expecting to be thrown to the wild beasts. On the way, he is said to have written seven epistles; six to the churches of Asia Minor, and one to Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna. These letters, it must be allowed, contain passages which at least bear throughout the stamp of antiquity. Such especially are the passages directed against Judaism, and against Docetism; but even the briefer revision, which is the one most entitled to confidence, has been very much interpolated. As the account of the martyrdom of Ignatius may be justly suspected, so too the letters which presuppose the correctness of this suspicious legend, do not wear at all a stamp of a distinct individuality of character, and of a man of these times addressing his last words to the churches. A hierarchical purpose is not to be mistaken.

“The letter to Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, wears very much the appearance of an idle compilation. That to the Roman Church possesses more decided marks of originality than the others.”—Neander’s General History of the Christian Religion, and Church. Vol. ii. p. 441—443.

PROMISES OF DIVINE SUCCOUR TO BELIEVERS. (See p. 323.)

GENERAL PROMISES.

“The Lord also will be a refuge for the oppressed; a refuge in time of trouble.” “The meek will he guide in judgment, and the meek will he teach his way.” “Wait on the Lord; be of good courage, and he shall strengthen thine heart.” “I will instruct thee, and teach thee in the way which thou shalt go: I will guide thee with mine eye.” “They that seek the Lord shall not want any good thing: many are the afflictions of the righteous; but the Lord delivereth him out of them all.” “The steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord though he fall, he shall not be utterly cast down: for the Lord upholdeth him with his hand. But the salvation of the righteous is of the Lord; He is their strength in the time of trouble. And the Lord shall help them, and deliver them; He shall deliver them from the wicked, and save them.” “God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. God is in the midst of her; she shall not be moved: God shall help her, and that right early.” “Cast thy burden upon the Lord, and he shall sustain thee: he shall never suffer the righteous to be moved.” “For the Lord God is a sun and shield: the Lord will give grace and glory: no good thing will he withhold from them that walk uprightly.” “He that dwelleth in the secret place of the Most High shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty. . . . He shall cover thee with his feathers, and under his wings shalt thou trust: his truth shall be thy shield and buckler. Because he hath set his love upon me, therefore will I deliver him, and I will answer him: I will be with him in trouble; I will deliver him, and honour him.” “The righteous shall flourish like the palm-tree, he shall grow like a cedar in Lebanon.” “He preserveth the souls of his saints; he delivereth them out of the hand of the wicked. Light is sown for the righteous, and gladness for the upright in heart.” “He will not suffer thy foot to be moved: he that

keepeth thee will not slumber. The Lord is thy keeper; the Lord is thy shade upon thy right hand. The sun shall not smite thee by day, nor the moon by night. The Lord shall preserve thee from all evil: he shall preserve thy soul." "As the mountains are round about Jerusalem, so the Lord is round about his people from henceforth even for ever." "Though I walk in the midst of trouble, thou wilt revive me; thou shalt stretch forth thine hand against the wrath of mine enemies, and thy right hand shall save me. The Lord will perfect that which concerneth me." "The Lord upholdeth all that fall, and raiseth up all that be bowed down." "Be not afraid of sudden fear, neither of the desolation of the wicked when it cometh: for the Lord shall be thy confidence, and shall keep thy foot from being taken." "In all thy ways acknowledge him, and he shall direct thy paths." "Say ye to the righteous, that it shall be well with him, for they shall eat the fruit of their doings." "He that walketh righteously, and speaketh uprightly he shall dwell on high: his place of defence shall be the munitions of rocks." "He giveth power to the faint: and to them that have no might, he increaseth strength They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary, and walk and not faint." "He shall feed his flock like a shepherd; he shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom and shall gently lead those that are with young." "Fear thou not, for I am with thee; be not dismayed; for I am thy God; I will strengthen thee; yea, I will help thee; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness." "I the Lord thy God will hold thy right hand, saying unto thee, Fear not: I will help thee." "I will bring the blind by a way that they know not; I will lead them in paths that they have not known; I will make darkness light before them, and crooked places straight." "When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee; and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee: when thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned; neither shall the flame kindle upon thee." "And all thy children shall be taught of the Lord; and great shall be the peace of thy children. In righteousness shalt thou be established: thou shalt be far from oppression: for thou shalt

not fear: and from terror; for it shall not come near thee." "He will keep the feet of his saints . . . for by strength shall no man prevail." "Come unto me, all ye that labour, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." "But the Lord is faithful, who shall stablish you, and keep you from evil." "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him." "Who also shall confirm you to the end." "God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it." "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God." "But my God shall supply all your need according to his riches in glory by Christ Jesus."*

SPECIAL PROMISES TO INDIVIDUALS AND NATIONS.

To Abraham:—"Fear not, Abraham, I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward." *To Jacob*:—"And behold I am with thee, and will keep thee in all places whither thou goest, and will bring thee again into this land; for I will not leave thee, until I have done that which I have spoken to thee of." *To Moses*:—"Now therefore go, and I will be with thy mouth, and teach thee what thou shalt say . . . And I will be with thy mouth, and his mouth, and will teach you what ye shall do." "And he said, My presence shall go with thee, and I will give thee rest." *To Joshua*:—"There shall not any man be able to stand before thee all the days of thy life; as I was with Moses, so I will be with thee, I will not fail thee, nor forsake thee. Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed: for the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest." *To Solomon*:—"Wisdom and knowledge is granted unto thee: and I will give thee riches and wealth and honour, such as none of the kings have had that have been before thee, neither shall there any

* Psa. ix. 9; xxv. 9; xxvii. 14; xxxii. 8; xxxiv. 10, 19; xxxvii. 23, 39, 40; xlv. 1, 6; lv. 22; lxxxiv. 11; xci. 1, 4, 14; xcii. 12; xcvi. 10; cxxi. 3, 5—7; cxxv. 2; cxxxviii. 7, 8; cxlv. 14; Prov. iii. 25, 26; iii. 6; Isa. iii. 10; xxxiii. 16, 17; xl. 29, 31; xl. 11; xli. 10, 13; xlii. 16; xliii. 2; liv. 13; 1 Sam. ii. 9; Matt. xi. 28; 2 Thess. iii. 3; James i. 5; 1 Cor. i. 8; x. 13; John vii. 17; Phil. iv. 19.

after thee have the like." *To Jeremiah*:—"And they shall fight against thee, but they shall not prevail against thee; for I am with thee, saith the Lord, to deliver thee." *To Zerubbabel*:—"Yet now be strong, O Zerubbabel, and be strong, O Joshua, the son of Josedech, the high priest; and be strong, all ye people of the land, and work; for I am with you, saith the Lord of hosts." *To the tribe of Benjamin*:—"And of Benjamin he said, The beloved of the Lord shall dwell in safety by him; and the Lord shall cover him all the day long, and he shall dwell between his shoulders." *To the Jews*:—"Be strong and of a good courage, fear not nor be afraid of them; for the Lord thy God he it is that doth go with thee; he will not fail thee, or forsake thee. And the Lord he it is that doth go before thee; he will be with thee; he will not fail thee, neither forsake thee; fear not, neither be dismayed." "And I will give them an heart to know me, that I am the Lord; and they shall be my people, and I will be their God, for they shall return unto me with their whole heart." "And I will make an everlasting covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them to do them good; but I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me." "And I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you; and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and I will give them a heart of flesh; that they may walk in my statutes, and keep mine ordinances, and do them." "For I, saith the Lord, will be unto her (Jerusalem) a wall of fire round about, and will be the glory in the midst of her." *To the Apostles*:—"When they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak." "For the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say." "I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay or resist. There shall not a hair of your head perish." *To Paul*:—"Then spake the Lord to Paul in the night by a vision, Be not afraid, but speak, and hold not thy peace; for I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee to hurt thee." "For there stood by me this night the angel of God, . . . saying, Fear not, Paul, thou must be brought before Cæsar: and, lo, God hath given thee all them that sail with thee." "And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee; for my strength is made perfect in weakness." "And the Lord shall deliver me

from every evil work, and will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom.”*

N. (page 249.)

“As *קָצַר רוּחַ*, *short of breath or spirit*, is contrasted with *אָדָּר אַפַּיִם*, *long suffering*, Prov. xiv. 29, and is obviously equivalent to *קָצַר אַפַּיִם*, ver. 17, (comp. *קָצַר רוּחַ*, Exod. vi. 9,) most of the moderns render in the present instance, *Is Jehovah prone to anger?* but prophecy being the subject to which reference had just been made, it is more natural to understand *רוּחַ דְּהוָה*, *the Spirit of Jehovah*, in its appropriated meaning, as designating the Divine author of prophetic communications; and to take the verb in the sense of *weakness or inability*. Comp. *קָצַר יָד*, *short of hand*, Isa. xxxvii. 27.”
—Dr. Henderson on the Minor Prophets.

O. (page 257.)

“Amidst those deep and retired thoughts, which, with every man Christianly instructed, ought to be most frequent of God, and of his miraculous ways and works, to be performed to him; after the story of our Saviour Christ, suffering to the lowest bent of weakness in the flesh, and presently triumphing to the highest pitch of glory in the Spirit, which drew up his body also; till we in both be united to him in the revelation of his kingdom, I do not know of anything more worthy to take up the whole passion of pity on the one side, and joy on the other, than to consider first the foul and sudden corruption, and then, after many a tedious age, the deferred, but much more wonderful and happy reformation of the church in these latter days. Sad it is to think how that doctrine of the Gospel, planted by teachers divinely inspired, and by them winnowed and sifted from the chaff of overdated ceremonies, and refined to such a spiritual height and temper of purity, and knowledge of the Creator, that

* Gen. xv. 1; xxviii. 15; Exod. iv. 12, 15; xxxiii. 14; Josh. i. 5, 9; 2 Chron. i. 12; Jer. i. 19; Hag. ii. 4; Deut. xxxiii. 12; Deut. xxxi. 6, 8; Jer. xxiv. 7; xxxii. 40; Ezek. xi. 19, 20; Zech. ii. 5; Matt. x. 9; Luke xii. 12; xxi. 15, 18; Acts xviii. 9, 10; xxvii. 24; 2 Cor. xii. 9; 2 Tim. iv. 18.

the body, with all the circumstances of time and place, were purified by the affections of the regenerate soul, and nothing left impure but sin ; faith needing not the weak and fallible office of the senses, to be either the ushers or interpreters of heavenly mysteries, save where our Lord himself in his sacraments ordained that such a doctrine should, through the grossness and blindness of her professors, and the fraud of deceivable traditions, drag so downwards, as to backslide into the Jewish beggary of old cast rudiments, and stumble forward another way into the new vomited paganism of sensual idolatry, attributing purity or impurity to things indifferent, that they might bring the inward acts of the Spirit to the outward and customary eye-service of the body, as if they could make God earthly and fleshly, because they could not make themselves heavenly and spiritual ; they began to draw down all the Divine intercourse betwixt God and the soul, yea, the very shape of God himself, into an exterior and bodily form, urgently pretending a necessity and obligation of joining the body in a formal reverence and worship circumscribed ; they hallowed it, they fumed it, they sprinkled it, they bedecked it, not in the robes of pure innocence, but of pure linen, with other deformed and fantastic dresses, in palls and mitres, gold, and gewgaws fetched from Aaron's old wardrobe, or the flamen's vestry ; then was the priest set to con his motions and his postures, his liturgies and his hurries, till the soul by this means of overbodying herself, given up justly to fleshly delights, bated her wing apace downward ; and finding the ease she had from her visible and sensuous colleague, the body, in performance of religious duties, her pinions now broken, and flagging, shifted off from herself the labour of high soaring any more, forgot her heavenly flight, and left the dull and droiling carcase to plod on in the old road, and drudging trade of outward conformity. And here out of question from her perverse conceiting of God and holy things, she had fallen to believe no God at all, had not custom and the worm of conscience nipped her incredulity ; hence to all the duties of evangelical grace, instead of the adoptive and cheerful boldness which our new alliance with God requires, came servile and thrall-like fear ; for in very deed, the superstitious man by his good-will is an atheist ; but being scared from thence by the pangs and gripes of a boiling conscience, all in a pudder

shuffles up to himself such a God and such a worship as is most agreeable to remedy his fear ; which fear of his, as also is his hope, fixed only upon the flesh, renders likewise the whole faculty of his apprehension carnal ; and all the inward acts of worship, issuing from the native strength of the soul, run out lavishly to the upper skin, and these harden into a crust of formality. Hence men came to scan the Scriptures by the letter, and in the covenant of our redemption, magnified the external signs more than the quickening power of the Spirit ; and yet looking on them through their own guiltiness with a servile fear, and finding as little comfort, or rather terror, from them again, they knew not how to hide their slavish approach to God's behests, by them not understood, not worthily received, but by cloaking their servile crouching to all religious presentments, sometimes lawful, sometimes idolatrous, under the name of humility, and terming the piebald frippery and ostentation of ceremonies, decency.

Then was baptism changed into a kind of exorcism ; and water, sanctified by Christ's institute, thought little enough to wash off the original spot, without the scratch or cross impression of a priest's forefinger : and that feast of free grace and adoption to which Christ invited his disciples to sit as brethren, and co-heirs of the happy covenant, which at that table was to be sealed to them, even that feast of love and heavenly-admitted fellowship, the seal of filial grace, became the subject of horror, and gloating adoration, pageanted about like a dreadful idol, which sometimes deceives well-meaning men, and beguiles them of their reward, by their voluntary humility ; which indeed is fleshly pride, preferring a foolish sacrifice, and the rudiments of the world, as St. Paul to the Colossians explaineth, before a savoury obedience to Christ's example. Such was Peter's unseasonable humility, as then his knowledge was small, when Christ came to wash his feet ; who at an impertinent time would needs strain courtesy with his Master, and falling troublesomely upon the lowly, all-wise, and unexaminable intention of Christ, in what he went with resolution to do, so provoked by his interruption the meek Lord, that he threatened to exclude him from his heavenly portion, unless he could be content to be less arrogant and stiffnecked in his humility.

But to dwell no longer in characterizing the depravities of the

church, and how they sprung, and how they took increase; when I recall to mind at last, after so many dark ages, wherein the huge overshadowing train of error had almost swept all the stars out of the firmament of the church; how the bright and blissful Reformation (by Divine power) struck through the black and settled night of ignorance and anti-christian tyranny, methinks a sovereign and reviving joy must needs rush into the bosom of him that reads or hears; and the sweet odour of the returning Gospel imbathe his soul with the fragrancy of heaven. Then was the sacred Bible sought out of the dusty corners where profane falsehood and neglect had thrown it, the schools opened, Divine and human learning raked out of the embers of forgotten tongues, the princes and cities trooping apace to the new-erected banner of salvation; the martyrs, with the unresistible might of weakness, shaking the powers of darkness, and scorning the fiery rage of the old red dragon."—Of Reformation in England. By John Milton, 1641.

P. (page 388.)

"Before, however, we advance to the explanation of particulars, we must here take up a question, the answer to which has an influence upon the comprehension of the whole following section. The question is this, whether is the usual condition of a person standing under the law, or of one under grace, here described? The different views taken of this subject deeply affect doctrine and morals, and the pastoral care. If, indeed, the least notice is paid to the connection of this section of the seventh chapter, with that which precedes and that which follows, it is not possible to explain it of any other than of a person standing under the law. There is much truth in what Adam Clarke says in his commentary: 'If the contrary could be proved, the argument of the opponent would go to demonstrate the insufficiency of the Gospel as well as the law.' We must, however, point the attention to the grounds of our opinion. The thesis of this second portion of the chapter stands in verse 5th, where the condition of the legalist is described as one altogether sinful. In like manner the thesis of chapter viii. is in verse 6th, where the condition of the believer is described, as one of relative freedom from

sin. Now, as Paul has undertaken the task of pointing out the holiness of the law as such, and what is the true ground of sin, it is manifest that he here paints the state of the legalist. The seventh and eighth chapters, too, are as decidedly counterparts to each other, as are the fifth and sixth verses of the former. At the close of that chapter, we read under the formula *ἄρα οὖν*, the compressed result of the section under review. It states that to be insuperable discord. On the other hand, at the commencement of the eighth chapter, under the same formula, we read the result of something previously stated with respect to the condition of the believer, and that is the doing away of condemnation, and a walk after the Spirit. The *οὖν* in this 1st verse corresponds entirely with the *οὖν* in chapter vii. 6. Just again, as in this manner the vii. and viii. chapters are throughout opposed the one to the other, so likewise several particulars. The complaint, verse 24th, answers to the thanksgiving, verse 5th. Whilst the subject of the description speaks of himself, ver. 23, as taken captive under the law of sin, the subject of the description in chap. viii. declares himself at ver. 2, to be delivered from the law of sin. While, chap. vii. 14, an invincible strife is maintained between the spiritual law and the carnal mind, and the person in ver. 18, cannot find how to perform that which is good, the believer, according to chap. viii. 4, fulfils the righteousness of the law by walking after the Spirit. In fine, while, chap. vii. 5, we read *ὅτε ἡμεν ἐν σαρκί*, we read, chap. viii. 9, *ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν σαρκί*. Many of these points, along with the connection, have been admirably developed by Turretin. Accordingly, the mere consideration of the substance and connection of the two chapters, were there nothing else, furnishes a definite result. Besides this, however, the dignity and the spirit of Christianity would forbid us to suppose that all it can accomplish is to waken a sense of the inward discord, without being able to do it away. That sense many teachers of the ancient world knew how to waken, although certainly not so thoroughly as Christianity; but actually to secure the ascendancy for the principle, which ought to be predominant in man, was what no philosophy could affect. Adam Clarke: ‘This opinion has most pitifully

and shamefully not only lowered the standard of Christianity, but destroyed its influence, and disgraced its character.'

Let us now survey the history of the exposition of this section. The more ancient teachers of the church had unanimously explained it of the man who has not as yet become a Christian, nor is upheld in his struggle by the Spirit of Christ. So Origen, Tertullian, Chrysostom, and Theodoret. At an earlier period, Augustine also followed this view. (Prop. 41, in Ep. ad Rom., Confes. l. vii. c. 21; l. viii. c. 5; Ad Simpl. l. i.) In the dispute with the Pelagians, however, the two declarations, verse 17, and verse 22, raised his scruples. These, he thought, could not be put into the mouth of a man prior to regeneration, for then they would assign him too lofty a degree of personal goodness, (Aug. Cont. duas Epp. Pelag. l. i. c. 12. Retract. l. i. c. 23; l. ii. c. 1.) In determining the question, all depends upon the conception we form of *regeneration*. Under that word, the fathers frequently comprise two different moral states; one, the state of inward dissension, in which the person has before his mind's eye his own and the Divine will, and struggles which of the two he ought to follow; the other, the state of living *κατὰ πνεῦμα*, in which the inclinations and dispositions of man are in unison with the Divine will, and love prompts him spontaneously to obey it. By a person *regenerated* they understand generally, one who has at heart the fulfilment of the will of God. Is regeneration conceived in this comprehensive sense, then is the *unregenerate* one without law, one in whom no sense at all of inward discord has as yet been called forth. It was just of such reckless sinners, and, indeed, more particularly of Jews, who entertained *more or less* the persuasion of the bindingness of the law, that the fathers of the church understood these declarations of Paul. Now certainly, in declaring himself for the contrary, Augustine had sufficient ground; for in persons of this description no such lively discord as the apostle here paints is discoverable. Calvin justly observes: 'Homo suæ naturæ relictus, totus sine repugnantia in cupiditates fertur. Quanquam enim impii stimulis conscientiae lanciuntur, non possis tamen inde colligere aut malum ab illis odio haberi, aut amari bonum.' If, then, we call the person here described an unregenerate man, we understand by the name, a legalist; one who is seriously

concerned about his sanctification, zealously strives after purity of heart, and who falls short of the mark, only because he does not set out from that love which first loved him, but thinks by his own, to deserve the love of God, because the redemption of Christ is not the fountain from which his holiness emanates free and lively as a stream. For just as art with its toilsome and piecemeal labours stands related to nature, with her free and wholesale creations, so also is the law, as a schoolmaster of holiness, related to free grace as an affectionate mother. Now, although on this ground, we certainly cannot, according to the Gospel, regard such a legal state of concern, as amounting to regeneration, it still is nevertheless a work of the Spirit of God; so that the *θέλω τὸ ἀγαθὸν* and the *συνῆδομαι τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ νοός μου*, are unquestionably to be regarded as a divine operation (*gratia præveniens*).

Among later expositors, by far the greater number acquiesced entirely either with Augustine or with the Greek fathers. The former was followed by Anselm, Thom. Aquinas, Corn. a Lapide, and many others; the latter by Erasmus, Faustus Socinus (who wrote a very complete treatise, *De Loco in Ep. ad Rom. c. vii. Disp. ed. 2, Racov. 1612. Defensio disputationis illius, Rac. 1618.*) by Raphelius, Arminius, Episcopius in a letter to Arminius, but of no very great weight, *Epp. Ecclesiasticæ, Amst. 1684, Ep. 131, p. 228*, by Limborch, Turretin, Clericus, Herrmann, and many more.

A different view, however, gained ground among those protestants who had apprehended more deeply the nature of the Christian doctrine as unfolded by Paul. They discriminated distinctly betwixt the lawless, the legal, and the spiritual or regenerate state. One class, to which Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, Spener, Buddeus, and many others belong, supposed that chapters vii. and viii., taken together, present us with a description of the regenerate man; so as that chapter vii. delineates one aspect of his inward life, in virtue of which he does not as yet belong to Christ; while chapter viii. especially delineates the other side of evangelical consolation, which lies in the certainty of the objective redemption. A second class, however, to which Bucer, Schomer, A. H. Franke, Gottfr. Arnold, Bengel, and others (Spener also in his *Theol. Bedenk, Th. 1. sect. 23.*) belong, separate between the vii. and viii. chapters, as descriptive of two

different periods, the former the condition of the legalist, who is indeed in earnest in the business, but does not found his sanctification upon grace, and who consequently is unable to triumph over sin; the latter, the state of the justified man, who seeks to kindle his own love at the love of God. To this explanation we likewise fully assent, appealing in proof of it to the explication given above of the connection. With respect to the two opposite views, those who suppose a person totally without law to be meant, lay a stress upon two points. The expressions, say they, in verses 15 and 22, *θέλω, μισῶ, συνήδομαι*, do not necessarily denote an actual *inclination of the heart* to that which is good; they *may* designate merely the approval of the understanding. (See the exposition of these verses.) In like manner, according to the phraseology of Paul, *νοῦς* and *ἔσω ἄνθρωπος* do not stand directly for *Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ*. On that supposition it might be remarked, that Paul contemplated the state of the lawless man, from the state in which he himself stands, and which has been matured into self-consciousness, and transfers into it his present feelings. In point of fact, personal feelings may have a share in the exclamations of Paul at verse 24. It is impossible to think, however, that the apostle, merely from his after sensations, describes a strife as taking place where it does not actually exist, and yet following the exegetical feeling, one is inclined, both to suppose in general, that here such a strife is described, and also to regard *θέλω, μισῶ, συνήδομαι* as denoting it. Generally, however, the condition of a person without law is delineated in the 9th verse, and, in fact, how different is it as there described from the condition of the legalist! The first class we mentioned of evangelical expositors, give the sense and connection of the section as follows: up to verse 14, Paul speaks in the preterite tense, and hence describes the early contention of the legalist with the law, in which (verse 11) he is overthrown. Onward from verse 14, he desires still more fundamentally to show the divinity of the law, and hence represents it in conflict with the man regenerate, on which account we have then the present. True that even in the case of the latter, sin has the ascendancy, still it no longer meets with the inward consent. There is a war waged, but along with that, there is the inward peace, such as is described viii. 1. This view of Augustine's is also recommended by a great truth which should not be overlooked, viz.

that somewhat of the legal state ever manifests itself anew in the redeemed, and times without number occur in life, in which he can apply to himself what Paul here says. (And hence it is with truth that Beza observes: *Nam certe ita est, et qui hoc non novit, nondum seipsum novit.* Compare Spener Theol. Bed. B. 1, s. 167, where he makes similar remarks in defence of the view of Augustine. Arndt has some peculiarly excellent expressions to the same effect. *Vom wahren Christenthum*, B. 1, c. 16.) Hence it is that Bugenhagen observes:—*Quantum in nobis peccati et veteris Adæ, tantum adhuc habet imperii lex*, which may be thus understood;—as long as the love of sin remains alive within us, so long will this inveterate discord likewise be manifested. It must, however, be observed, in opposition, that the love of sin is gradually extinguished in the Christian, in respect, first, of sins of a gross, and afterwards of those of a more refined, description; so that thus, as Augustine early expresses himself, the Christian is then no more *sub lege*, but *cum lege*. Moreover, even though the love of sin do stir up within him the discord which is here portrayed, the Christian need not permit himself to be overcome in the struggle. He has the objective announcement of his redemption, and so when by a believing direction of the mind, he acquiesces therein, the power of the *χάρις* is realized subjectively in his faith. It is true, this is not always the case; frequently does the *σάρξ* triumph over the *πνεῦμα*. At any rate, however, these occasions are to be considered abnormal in the Christian life, as they do not occur in it in so far as it is, but only in so far as it has not yet become, Christian. They must hence be there only as something evanescent.

Respecting the subdivision, again, which these interpreters make at verse 14, there is no ground for it at all, inasmuch as what follows, from that verse, and onwards, with respect to the contest with the law, is just what was already said in the previous context; nor considering the lively manner of describing which St. Paul loves, is the circumstance that thenceforward verbs present are used, by any means extraordinary.

Having thus answered the important question, whether in this section the legalist or the justified man is spoken of, we have now still to inquire, whether Paul throughout the whole of it, where he speaks in the first person, speaks of himself and his own circumstances, or whether he transfers to himself

the circumstances of others. Augustine is of the former opinion, and many go along with him. On that supposition, however, it is still more incredible, that the apostle, in the words of the chapter, should paint that state of his as lasting. Supposing it again only momentarily such as he describes it, he had no occasion, as we have remarked, to represent these transient, exceptional states of inward life as peculiarly Christian. Even Origen felt that such an acknowledgment, when considered as applicable to the present, did not become St. Paul: *Et cætera in quibus confitetur a lege, quæ in membris suis est, et repugnat legi mentis suæ, captivum duci se lege peccati, quomodo apostolicæ convenient dignitati et Paulo præcipue, in quo Christus et vivit et loquitur.* Hence even in the ancient church, among Origen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Jerome, and Pelagius, the opinion was more general, that Paul transfers to himself the state of others. Cases of the same kind, called in his own language *μετασχηματισμός*, 1 Cor. iv. 6, are frequently to be met with in St. Paul's writings, 1 Cor. vi. 12; x. 23, 29, 30; xiii. 11, 12; Gal. ii. 18. Hence likewise we find by turns, chap. vii. 14, and viii. 1, the plural used, which goes through the whole of the viii. chapter. With regard to the person whose state he takes to himself, Chrysostom, Grotius, Clericus, and indeed most others, look upon the Jews before and under the law as intended; Erasmus maintains a contraposition of the Gentile *without*, and the Jew *under* the law. Theodoret, at verse 9 and 10, imagines that there is no less than an assumption of the person of Adam. But Pelagius and Photius, even in their day, hit upon the truth, the one supposing generally a transference of the circumstances of a person about to be, and of a person that already is, converted, *i.e.*, he thinks that state of man to be meant, in which the individual has not yet been brought to a knowledge of the obligation of the law, and that wherein the law presents itself to him as obligatory. Phot. *τοῦτο οὐκ εἰς ἑαυτὸν ὁ Παῦλος εἴρηκεν, ἀλλὰ τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης οἰκειούμενος φύσεως.** Ambrose: *Sub suâ persona quasi generalem causam agit.* It certainly cannot well be denied, as the occasional substitution of the plural shews, that the Apostle depicts generally

* Paul does not say this of himself, but appropriating the person of human nature.

the relation of the law and afterwards that of grace to man, and in so far makes use of the *μετασχηματισμός*. But then, Paul had himself passed through the states which he describes; he had himself experienced in his own person the insufficiency of a religious law, imposing mere outward commands and obligations. And hence what more natural than that he should at the same time speak on the subject from personal experience, in such a way as that it might be hard to sever what is *μετασχηματισμός*, and what delineation of his own feelings. We require always to keep in view, that Paul compresses individual experiences into general propositions and results. That what he says does emanate from his own inward life and experience, is particularly apparent from verse 25.

The apostle accordingly designs, in the first place, to shew that the law, in virtue of its own inward nature, does not produce the *ἀμαρτία*. He means to declare what use it answers. Its great use is, that it teaches us to recognise sin as sin. Œcumenius: Ὡστε οὐ τοῦ ποιεῖν, ἀλλὰ τοῦ διαγινώσκειν τὴν ἀμαρτίαν ὁ νόμος αἷτιος. Pelagius: Excusationem ignorantiae abstulit, gravior enim facit quam ante peccare.

To this he appends a confirmation. *τὴν τε γὰρ ἐπιθυμίαν*, &c. We may co-ordinate this with the preceding clause, and regard the *ἐπιθυμία* as a particular *ἀμαρτία*, "I myself, e.g., had not known sin, except," &c. The proposition, however, becomes far weightier, when by *ἐπιθυμία* we understand the inward sinful propensity. "I knew not sin in general, because I had not been made attentive to its inward root." After *ἐπιθυμῆσαι*, we have to supply, "and so on," Ex. xx. 14; Deut. v. 18.—Tholuck on the Romans, chap. vii. 7, 8.

After recapitulating the judgments of Dr. Tholuck, Rüdert, De Wette, and Meyer, Dr. Olshausen adds the following valuable observations: "These learned men, nevertheless, quite rightly acknowledge, that the Augustinian representation has also something true in it, since that in the life of the regenerate, moments occur in which they must speak entirely as Paul expresses himself here; and, moreover, as it is only by degrees that the transforming power of the Gospel penetrates the different tendencies of the inward life, congenial phenomena extend through the whole life of the believer; and this leads to the thought, that the two views might admit of being

united in a higher one. For it is little probable beforehand, that men like Augustine and the reformers should have *entirely* erred in the conception of so important a passage. It may perhaps become perceptible from the following mode of laying out the context, how such a difference of views could be formed in the interpretation of the passage, and what in such difference is right and what erroneous.

First of all, it is evident that the Apostle's purpose is, to sketch a description of the inward process of development from its first beginnings to the highest perfection. He sets out, vii. 9, from the state in which the man is living entirely without law, and closes viii. 11, with the glorification of the bodily substance. The question occurs here, how many stages of development are properly distinguished? *Four* clearly present themselves. *First*, a life without law, in which sin is dead; *next*, a life under the law, in which sin becomes alive and has dominion; *further*, a state in which, by the power of Christ, the Spirit has dominion, and sin is mastered; *finally*, the state of the entire separation of sin by the glorification of the bodily substance. If by *regeneration* all is to be understood from the first stirrings of grace, the whole of the Apostle's description may then be applied to the regenerate, because the very needfulness of the law is called forth by grace. But it is surely more correct and scriptural to call regeneration that inward process only, by which after the need of redemption is awakened, the power of Christ becomes mighty in the mind; so that a new spiritual man enters into being, and exercises his ruling power. According to this acceptation, the state under the law cannot co-exist with regeneration, and without question therefore, as vii. 24 is to express the awakened need of redemption, and ver. 25 the experience of redemption itself, verses 14—24 are to be referred to a position *before* regeneration, and to be understood as a description of the conflict within an *awakened person*. As, however, the apostle makes use of the present for this section, while before and afterwards he applies the aorist, we are led to the idea, that he does not intend to have this state of conflict regarded as concluded with the experience of redemption. In the description, verses 14—24 itself too, as will afterwards be more particularly shewn, an *advance* in the conflict with sin is clearly observ-

able, the better *I* stands out in the man more and more, and the pleasure in God's law grows gradually in him. To this, ver. 17, speaks especially the *νυνὶ δὲ οὐκ ἔτι*, and ver. 20, *οὐκ ἔτι*, which indicates a bygone state. In a far higher degree, as ver. 25 expresses, is this the case *after* the experience of the redeeming power of Christ, where the conflict with sin is described as for the most part victorious on the side of the better part in man. But a conflict remains still, even *after* the experience of regeneration; and that even the regenerate man does not *always* hold it victoriously, that even for him times of temptation, of very hard temptation, come on, the Scripture sanctions in express declarations (comp. at 1 John ii. 1) and in communications upon the life of the apostles even as the experience of all saints of all times sanctions it. If we add to this consideration, that in proportion with the true advance in the life of faith, the spiritual glance into the stirrings of sin, sharpens the conscience, refines and censures strictly even the smaller deviations, which had else on lower standards remained unnoticed; it is clearly right that Augustine and the great doctors of the church who followed him, should have declared, that even the regenerate man can and must say of himself, all that the apostle, verses 14—24, utters. The best manner, therefore, in which we can express ourselves upon the question, whether Paul is here treating of the regenerate, is, that in the passage, verses 14—24, he *immediately* describes the state of the man *before* regeneration, since his purpose is, to set forth coherently the whole course of development; in the consciousness, however, that phenomena entirely similar present themselves within the regenerate man, he makes the description applicable to the regenerate also. The opinion, therefore, on the *one* side, that the apostle *immediately and directly* intends the regenerate, is as absolutely wrong, as on the *other* side the assertion, that in the regenerate man *nothing* like what is described, verses 14—24, can or ought to be found. The distinction between the conflict and the fall of the unregenerate and the conflict and fall of the regenerate remains, notwithstanding the subjective feeling of their near affinity, objectively so great (as at vii. 24, 25 will be proved) that the anxiety, lest by the view proposed, regeneration should be robbed of its essential character, must appear to be quite un-

founded.* If we now look back again to the first question, of which period of his life the apostle could say such things as he utters, verses 14—24, it is clear that he cannot be immediately describing the state of his soul after the Lord's appearing to him by Damascus, but that he is speaking of his inward conflicts under the yoke of the law; but the transition into the present certainly indicates, that even in his state at the time he wrote, sensations were still sounding, which made him exclaim with perfect truth, although with incomparably finer application to more delicate circumstances than in his former state (comp. at vii. 24, 25): What I would I do not, and what I would not, that I do; wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death! (comp. at 2 Cor. xii. 7, &c.)—Olshausen on the Romans, pp. 237—240.

“In the passage here referred to, from the seventh chapter to the Romans, St. Paul is by many understood to speak not in his own person, but in the assumed character of a carnal, or unconverted man. The apostle appears to me to have guarded his language against that construction by the introduction of the words, *αὐτος ἐγὼ*, in the last clause of it; in addition to which the following statements, which occur in the course of his argument, seem to be quite inconsistent with that hypothesis. ‘To will that which is good, is present with me. I would do good. I delight in the law of God in the inward man. With the mind I serve the law of God.’ This is not the language of an unconverted man; and the profession throughout is of the same character, being that of a man who knew what was right, and strove to follow it, but found a counter-vailing principle in that corrupt nature, which he in common with all of us inherited from Adam, and which continually thwarted those better inclinations which were implanted in him by the grace of God. Hence he constantly speaks of himself, not only here, but in other epistles, as maintaining a warfare, following after what he had not yet attained, and attributing all his successes to Christ dwelling in him, just

* Reiche has strikingly failed in his acceptance of this passage; he holds that the Jewish humanity, comprehended in the apostle's person, is speaking here. The one-sided reference of the *νομος* merely to the Jewish ceremonial law, is the immediate cause of this clearly false acceptance; that one-sided reference itself, however, is founded in the dogmatic principles of this learned man.

as he here attributes his failure to sin dwelling in him, till at last, when he could say: 'I have finished my course,' he was enabled to say also, 'I have fought a good fight.' It may be objected to this exposition, that he himself says at the beginning of the passage—'I am carnal,'—an assertion which may be thought as incompatible with a state of grace, as those which I have before quoted are with a state of unconverted nature. But the purest Christian is still carnal in part; every human being is one who has been sold, *πεπραμενος*, under sin: and the apostle limits his confession to the depraved appetites of his original nature, as contradistinguished from those in which he served the law of God, by the parenthetical phrase 'In me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing.' In fact, though he felt the motions of the flesh, warring in his members against the law of his mind, yet this latter was the law which he deliberately followed; and therefore, with whatever impediments from within he still walked, he still determined his course, and made progress in it, not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."—The Christian Doctrine of Sanctification. Bampton Lecture, pp. 283, 284. 1848. By the Rev. E. G. Marsh.

To these expositions I have great pleasure in adding the following reply to a letter which I addressed not long since to one of the most experienced Biblical critics in Europe:—

"So far as I can find my way through Olshausen's mysticism, I think he inclines, on the whole, to the view that Paul exhibits his own experience as a type of all regenerate persons.

The conclusions at which I have arrived on the subject, are, that, notwithstanding the strong language employed by the Apostle in reference to carnality, it does appear that, in order to put anything like a construction upon his argument, we must maintain that it is the experience of a renewed soul which he sets forth from ver. 14, onward, and that this gracious and renewed soul was none other than himself. In support of this construction, I would humbly submit the following reasons:

1. The Apostle employs the personal pronouns *I*, *me*, and *my*, not fewer than *forty* times within the compass of twelve verses, without the least intimation of a transition at ver. 14 from the experience of one person to that of another. He even employs the emphatic compound '*I MYSELF*,' which ought to remove all dubiety.

2. The ardour of feeling which he throws into his language produces a powerful conviction in favour of this view of the subject. He writes like one who was at the time painfully sensible of what he describes, and not like one who is merely describing what is felt by another.

3. There are several terms and phrases occurring in the passage which scarcely, if at all, admit of application to any but believers. Such as 'the inward man' (comp. 2 Cor. iv. 16,) 'the law of the mind,' 'delighting in and serving the law of God with the mind,' 'not allowing that which is evil,' and thanking God for victory through the Saviour: while all the expressions which seem to militate against a state of grace are easily accounted for on the principle of indwelling sin.

4. The writer employs in part the identical phraseology, Gal. v. 17. The two passages are perfectly parallel. It is the same conflict both describe, the conflict of believers with the evil principles of their corrupt nature."

Q. (page 390.)

V. 7. "Against the seductive, loose ethics of half Christianity, which engenders love of the world in the mind, from which all *κρίσις* and all moral ideals are absent, St. John opposes the strict genuine Christian proposition: that beside the perfect *δικαιοσύνη* as it was in Christ, no true *δικαιοσύνη* exists. We should ever bear in mind that St. John here everywhere speaks, not of the different degrees of perfection which struggling Christians have reached; but of the ideal and absolute difference between Christian virtue and piety, and sin in general. And in a similar sense we also read, in

V. 8. Whosoever does sin is, in as far as he sins, of the devil, the devil's child.—cfr. Gospel viii. 44. Since God is light, and there is no darkness in him, but whosoever is good, whosoever walketh in the light is born of God, and whosoever is born of God cannot sin, cfr. v. 9, St. John concludes that sinning, and all that is sinful, is of the devil. With reference to the ethical *κρίσις*, there is, according to St. John, no medium between God and the filial relation to God, on the one side, and the communion with the devil on the other. But why is every one who sins, of the devil? St. John answers, because from the

beginning, (not since the devil's, but since the fall of man, Gen. ii. cfr.; John viii. 44,*) the devil sins, (ever continues sinning, ἀμαρτάνει,) *i.e.* because the devil, since he brought sin into the world, never has ceased, as ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου, to seduce man to sin, so that all man's sin comes from him, he being the author of sin. Εἰς τοῦτο ἐφάν, is again connected with verse 5, and forms the transition to the subsequent passage, but at the same time contains this idea, that because Christ has destroyed the devil's power, every one who believes in Christ has the ἐξουσία to become God's child, cfr. Gospel i. 12. By ἔργα τ. διαβ. the seductive activity and energy—the power of the devil, is to be understood. But the devil's power and activity Christ has destroyed, (λύει, cfr. Gospel ii. 19,) by his work of redemption and atonement, cfr. ver. 5, Gosp. xii. 31; xvi. 11.

Σπέρμα αὐτοῦ (τοῦ θεοῦ,) ver. 9, is by Clem. Alex. Augustine, Grotius, and others, understood as meaning the seed of God's word. In support of this opinion are quoted, Matt. xiii. 23; 1 Pet. i. 23; James i. 18. But these passages prove nothing; their figurative context is quite different. The figurative expression would, in this case, be indirect, and lacking motive; being obscure, without an illustrative opposition, it would hardly be excusable with an author whose figures generally are perspicuous and pleasing. Moreover, the idea thus produced, would, in respect of form, not be Johaneic.

Not λόγος τ. θεου, the word of God; but πνεῦμα τ. θεοῦ is, according to St. John, the generating principle of God's children, cfr. Gospel St. John, iii. 6, sqq. Yet, clearly, σπέρμα has a reference to γεννηθῆναι ἐκ τοῦ θεου, and must be considered as an amplification of this figurative expression; it is the Divine power, by which the children of God are, as it were, generated, and, by this word, St. John expresses either the innate godly principle in man, ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι, *in sensu latiori*; or, since he is here speaking of regeneration and the filial relation to God through Christ, he denotes by it, the πνεῦμα ἁγιον, by which man is born anew of God, cfr. Gospel iii. 6, sqq., through which he, as St. Paul says, calls God *Father*, in short, the πνεῦμα υἰοθεσίας.†

* See the Author's Commentary on this passage of the Gospel.

† Lange takes σπέρμα in the same sense as the Hebrew זרע, giving to it the signification of offspring; he refers both αὐτοῦ and ἐν αὐτῷ to God, and translates thus: "for his (God's) children remain in him, (continue faithful to him)." But

The Scholion in Matthäi says, very correctly, that here is meant τὸ πνευματικὸν χάρισμα, ὃ μένον ἐν ἡμῖν ἀνεπίδεκτον ἁμαρτίας τὸν νοῦν ποιεῖ. As St. John takes the birth of God, and the filial relation to God, in its fullest and most ideal sense, the sentiment contained in ver. 9, is easily understood. If man is, quite and entirely, and in the most perfect manner, born again of God, the Divine σπέρμα or πνεῦμα must necessarily *remain* in him. Every diminution, every loss of this seed, is a proof that the birth of God was not perfect. St. John, however, far from wishing to instil the doctrine of the irresistibility of the Divine grace, says no more than this: that in God, and in godly life, absolutely considered, there is nothing imperfect, nothing weak, no half-and-half of light and darkness. Neither is there any difficulty in the last proposition of the verse, καὶ οὐ δύναται ἁμαρτ., we only must bear in mind, that St. John's point of view here is, that of the ideal and absolute Divine κρίσις. In such a context as that of our passage, it is literally true, that as little as sin and evil can be imagined in God, as little can he, who is really born of God, as long as he is, and continues such, *commit sin*, in that sense of the word which was laid down in verse 8.* Οὐ δύναται must, accordingly, not be softened or modified by the substitution of any other notion implying οὐ θέλει, but it is to be taken quite strictly, and, of course, in a moral sense.† "Οτι, likewise, here in both places, St. John uses in the acceptance of *because*, cfr. verse 14. What St. Jerome observes against Jovian, and Calovius approves, that ὅτι here is equivalent to *quamdiu*, *quatenus*, *quousque*, very much tends to render the idea more perspicuous from another point of view than that of St. John.

the parallel conclusion of the proposition, as well as the whole context of the figure and the ideas, is adverse to this.

* Jovianus seems to have understood our passage in the same manner, when, taking it and verse 18 for his warrant, and following Jerome, he maintained: eos, qui plena fide in baptismate renati sunt, a diabolo non posse *subverti*. Quicunque tentati fuerint, ostendi eos aqua tantum et non spiritu baptizatos. Jovianus had adopted an ideal point of view, similar to that of St. John; and the principal object of his reforming moral-critical endeavours, which were directed against the hypocrisy, outside fairness, and lukewarmness of Christian life in his age, was to re-establish the fundamental principles and ideals of the Gospel in their full clearness, precision, and truth.

† (Ecumenius says: Οὐ κατὰ φυσικὴν ἀδυναμίαν τοῦτο λέγει, ἀλλὰ κατὰ προαιρετικὴν τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἀργίαν.

The parænetic import of ver. 7—9, seems to be this: As betwixt the true life which is of God, according to this pattern given by Christ, and the devil's servitude, there can exist for man no third or intermediate thing, and moral man, accordingly, in ideal respect, must either entirely belong to God, or entirely to the devil:—the motive for abandoning all moral half-measures and irresolution is very urgent. He, then, who has rightly appreciated the character, the force and the power of God's children, and well considered what, as a child of God, he *ought to do*, and what, by means of the Divine seed which he has received, he *can do*, will the more decidedly renounce the world, and endeavour to acquire the divine *ἀγνότης δικαιοσύνης*, as it was in Christ, since he only, by that means, can participate in the communion with God, and in the glory of God's children, (ver. 2, 3.)

Because the world neither knows nor appreciates the difference between God's children, and those who are not God's children; St. John adds, with great emphasis, in ver. 10, 'Εν τούτῳ φανερά ἐστι τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὰ τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου. This distinction is *manifest* only in the light of the Divine κρίσις. The uncritical world confounds and mingles together good and evil, God and devil. As to the Hebrew phrase τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου,—cfr. John viii. 44, it expresses a mere ethical relation.*—pp. 196—200.

"An essential department of Christianity, in the apostolic age, was the intercessive prayer, more specially for the eternal welfare of the brethren, cfr. 1 Thess. v. 25; Phil. i. 4; Heb. xiii. 18, 19; James v. 14—20. St. John passes from Christian prayer in general, to Christian intercession, specially for *sinful* brethren. And as he has shown, ver. 14, 15, that only prayer full of confidence, and prayer according to God's will, is fulfilled, he here intimates that the Christian should *intercede* with God, only for that which is *capable of being accomplished*, accordingly not *περὶ ἁμαρτίας πρὸς θάνατον*, but only *περὶ ἁμαρτίας οὐ πρὸς θάνατον*.

Αἰτήσῃ, ver. 16, is here to be taken imperatively, or rather optatively. It is doubtful whether δώσει refers to the same subject as αἰτήσῃ, or whether, (since the giver of life is God, and

* Schöttgen. Hor. Heb. on this passage.

δώσει-ζωὴν can be said only indirectly of the interceder,) ὁ θεὸς is the subject to be supplied,* from the obvious reference of αἰτήσῃ to God. But the parallel, James v. 20, seems to decide in favour of the former. Since μὴ πρὸς θάνατον—ἀμαρτάνειν is the main condition of δώσει-ζωὴν, and αὐτῷ by the universality of the precept, obtains a collective application to all similar cases: St. John adds emphatically, τοῖς ἀμαρτάνουσι μὴ πρὸς θάνατον. Here, too, the regular use of μὴ and οὐ should also be observed. In a conditional ideal sense and context, ver. 16, St. John says: μὴ πρὸς θάνατον. But in verse 17, where the notion of “sin not unto death,” is taken quite objectively, he says οὐ πρὸς θάνατον. Ἵνα ἐρωτήσῃ refers regressively to εἰάν τις ἴδῃ in the beginning of the verse; Clemens, Origen, and some MSS. also read ἵνα τις ἐρωτήσῃ, or ἐρωτήσῃ τις.

In order to determine more precisely the notion of ἀμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον and ἀμαρτία οὐ πρὸς θάνατον, which is peculiar to St. John, we must establish the following maxims:—*First*, that here by “sin unto death” is to be understood no single *sin in particular*, but an entire class or species of sins.† (In the former case, the sin would have been mentioned more precisely and even by name;) but, *secondly*, that εἰάν τις ἴδῃ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ shews that here must be meant a species of sins which can occur among *Christians*, and not among those who are *not Christians*; *in the third place*, that the difference betwixt mortal sin, and sin not unto death, must be externally perceptible, and not unknown to the readers,‡ (otherwise the precept would be without an object, nay, dangerous: the difference would also have been stated more precisely); and, *fourth*, that as here only moral relations are spoken of, and as, according to the *usus loquendi* and the fundamental ideas of the epistle, by ζωὴ can be meant only spiritual life, ζωὴ αἰώνιος, cfr. iv. 9; the expression πρὸς θάνατον too, cannot by any means have a reference to bodily, but, as in iii. 14, only and exclusively to spiritual death.

If these general propositions are right, it follows that Stroth's explanation,§ (according to which it is supposed that St. John

* Accordingly Tertullian, the Syriac, Vulg., and some other versions, read and supply thus: et dabit ei Dominus.

† See Calvin on this passage.

‡ Calvin on this passage.

§ In Eichhorn's Repertor. for Oriental and Bibl. Literat. vol. xii. pp. 60, 61, 72, sqq.

allows an interceding prayer for the conversion and amendment of non-christian unbelievers, when they are docile, but that he forbids it when they are obstinate and malicious) is utterly untenable. It also follows, that both sense and context is entirely misunderstood by those who, by "sins unto death," understand such sins, as God punishes, either with mortal disease,* (morbis *θεηλάτοις*,) or with bodily death,† according to the language and legislation of the Old Testament and of the synagogues.

Still less can such sins be meant as were deemed to be capital crimes by the civil authority, and, accordingly, punished with death or visited with other severe penalties.‡ St. John would hardly have based his precept respecting intercession, on a notion so vague as that of morbi *θεηλάτοι* of his age. Even what the Lord said of him who was born blind, John ix. 3, must have prevented him. Further, as his readers chiefly were converted heathens, living under entirely different laws, St. John could not well allude to any Jewish ecclesiastical distinction betwixt sins unto death, and not unto death. His address would have been either entirely unintelligible, or it must have been misunderstood by uninformed readers. Least of all can this passage have any reference whatever to the heathen laws of the apostle's age, these being, in some respects, so repugnant to the Christian principle. Even the strict contrast between the fraternal community of Christians and the heathen kosmos, on which our epistle is founded, rendered such a reference impossible. In a word, the distinction betwixt sin unto death, and not unto death, must be one that is *peculiarly Christian*.

In the ancient church it was not unusual, by *ἁμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον* to understand blasphemy, or the sin against the Holy Ghost, cfr. Matt. xii. 21. § Beza, Calvin, || Flaccius, Calovius, Wolf, Herrmann, and others, are of the same opinion. Undoubtedly the sin against the Holy Ghost belongs to the species of *ἁμαρτ*.

* Zachariä, Michaelis, and others.

† Werenfel's Sylloge Dissert. Theol. p. 470, sqq.

‡ See Morus and Lange.

§ Augustine de Sermone Domini in monte, see Matt. xxii. sec. 73. Here, however, we find this view somewhat modified, of which more hereafter. The Schol. Matthäi, p. 230, *ἁμ. πρὸς θάν. ἐκεί. νην φησὶ, την εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα, βλασφημίαν, ἥτοι εἰς τὴν θεότητα*, cfr. p. 147.

|| But Calvin is doubtful.

πρὸς θάνατον. But if St. John meant that sin, why should he not have expressed himself more distinctly; why should he not have called it by the same name as Christ had called it? As the sin against the Holy Ghost, at all events, is an individual sin in the class of mortal sins, their highest, their scarcely imaginable culmination—as it is nowhere else mentioned by the apostles, nay more, as its possibility in the Christian world is, at least, doubtful, and its frequent occurrence in the apostolical communities certainly impossible; and, since it cannot be, by human means, determined whether an evil of such magnitude is really present in a given case: this particular sin cannot at all be meant here.

Another interpretation of the ancients is, that mortal sin, with St. John, denotes *ruthless sin*, which, as such, is deserving of eternal death, ὅταν τις ἁμαρτῶν ἀναισθήτως ἔχη πρὸς μετάνοιαν.* But this definition, referring to the μετάνοια, has no satisfactory basis in the context of our passage or our epistle. But Grotius is entirely in error when he declares those to be mortal sinners; qui cum peccaverint, moniti peccare pergunt, aut certe disciplinæ, quæ in ecclesia instituta est, se subicere nolunt. No vestige of the penitential discipline of the church is to be found in our passage; it is also difficult to conceive, why intercession in prayer could not be made for such sinners, cfr. 2 Tim. ii. 25, 26.

It is plain that St. John, by ἁμαρτ. πρὸς θάνατον can have meant, in general, only such sins of which *spiritual death* is the inevitable consequence, i. e., sins by which, according to the laws of the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, or of the κοινωνία μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, the capability for the Christian ζωὴ is necessarily abolished, and the Christian salvation lost.† As, according to St. John, the Christian ζωὴ is acquired, or the μετάβασις ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωὴν effected by the faith in Jesus Christ, and entirely accomplished by perfect and genuine brotherly-love (which

* Schol. Matthäi, p. 146, and p. 230. Ecumenius has also adopted this opinion, and he also (as the Schol. of Cod. H. and D. in Matthäi,) refers to Judas' example.

† The notion is relative, according to the more or less spiritual or ethical sense in which θάνατος is taken. Thus ἁμαρτία εἰς θάνατον in the Test. xii. Patrum Iaschar sec. vii. is, according to the context, either (sec. vi.) *ruthless sin*, or which on account of what follows is more probable, *a gross transgression of the law*, by which man is rendered subject to the dominion of the evil spirit, and by which he loses God's favour.

is the root of Christian life,) cfr. iii. 14 ; John v. 24 ; iii. 36 ; so also by *infidelity, worldly heresy* and *Cain-like want of love*, the Christian ζωὴ is again lost, and man repasses, as it were, from life into death, ἐκ τῆς ζωῆς εἰς τὸν θάνατον, i. e., *spiritual* not *eternal death*, is the necessary consequence of such cardinal sins,—cfr. ii. 17, 25 ; iii. 11—15. This, according to the context of our epistle, is the ἁμαρτ. πρὸς θάνατον, and it would be easily recognized by St. John's readers, from that which the apostle had said in the preceding part of this epistle. The culmination of this ἁμαρτία is the complete passing over into the κόσμος of darkness and of spiritual death, i. e., the apostasy from Christianity, cfr. Heb. x. 26, or idolatry. And thus, if this is the right explanation of St. John's idea, the context from verse 16 to verse 21, is easily construed.*

St. John distinguishes between an *internal* and an *external* community of Christians ; only the former consists of God's true children, the latter contains a medley of perfection and imperfection. He can, accordingly, without contradicting himself, iii. 6—9, and here, 18, quite well suppose the possibility of the existence of mortal sin *within* the Christian community. St. John does not declare, whether a *mortal sinner* can be converted or not, and he prohibits the Christian communities to intercede for the ἁμαρτάνοντες πρὸς θάνατον from no other motive than this, that otherwise the essential distinction betwixt good and evil, betwixt light and darkness, betwixt the communion with God and the communion with the world, would be weakened and obfuscated in the Christian's conscience. If, according to God's eternal law and judgment, the loss of eternal life in Christ (spiritual death,) is inseparably combined with the sins of infidelity, worldliness, and uncharitableness, because they directly abolish the Christian principle ; the true (the critical) Christian cannot, and may not implore God to give *life* to those who commit mortal sin. He would be asking what cannot be granted ; he

* I find a vestige of this interpretation in St. Augustine, in the place above mentioned: Peccatum fratris ad mortem puto esse, cum post agnitionem dei per gratiam domini nostri Jesu Christi quisque oppugnat fraternitatem et adversus ipsam gratiam, qua reconciliatus est Deo, invidentiæ facibus agitur; (subsequently he added, si in hac perversitate finierit hanc vitam.) Peccatum autem non ad mortem est si quisquam non amorem a fratre alienaverit, sed officia fraternitatis debita per aliquam infirmitatem animi non exhibuerit. Opp. August. tom. iii. sec. ii. p. 197, cfr. pp. 163, 164.

would be praying for that which is repugnant to God's will ; he would confound light with darkness, in God who is holy and just, and thus suppose a repugnance in God. The Christian may ask ζωή of God, only for such as do not sin unto death, and, consequently, do not annihilate the ζωή in themselves ; for in that case only his αἴτημα is κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, and can be granted, verse 14, 15.

It will appear from verse 17 and 18, that this is the right interpretation of the passage. For, as it might seem that the distinction betwixt the ἁμαρτ. θανατικῇ, and μὴ θανατικῇ (as Œcumenius calls it,) were repugnant to the above established absolute antithesis (iii. 7—9,) betwixt sinning and not sinning: St. John shews, verse 17, that indeed every ἀδικία (every action, and every intention which is contrary to the Divine law, every infringement on the δικαιοσύνη) is in its essence *sin* (ἁμαρτία the common Christian notion,) but that still there exists a difference as to the degree of *intensity and effect* of sin, betwixt the ἁμαρτ. πρὸς θάνατον and οὐ πρὸς θάνατον. The true Christian can, as such, according to St. John, not sin unto death ; he is subject to the sins not unto death, as long as he walketh in the flesh, cfr. ii. 1. St. John, therefore, adds this consolation, ver. 18 ; But we (also) know, that every one who is born of God, does not sin, cfr. iii. 9, (in this sense—ἁμαρτ. πρὸς θάνατον,) but that (ὅτι is to be supplied,) he who is born of God (being ever intent on sanctifying himself,) keepeth himself from so sinning (τηρεῖ ἑαυτὸν, i. e., ἀγνόν, ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου, cfr. James i. 27 ; 1 Tim. v. 22 ; Wisd. x. 5,) and thus is unassailable to the evil one (ὁ πονηρὸς οὐχ ἄπτεται αὐτοῦ,* cfr. Wisd. xviii. 20,) the prince of this world, who maintains the sway of darkness and death over his own, cfr. Col. i. 15 ; Eph. vi. 12. sqq.

Verse 19. The devil then has no power over us—over us who know that we are of God, and not of the world ; the world only, aye, the whole of it, is in his power, καὶ ὁ κόσμος ὅλος (as contrasted with God's children—the *entire* non-Christian and anti-Christian κόσμος,—no man, who in any respect whatever belongs to the world, excepted) ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ, (i. e., in the ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου) κείται, is in his power, under his sway, and subjected to him, cfr. 2 Macc. iv. 33, and other places."†—A Commentary on the

* A similar sense of ἄπτεται we also find in the Classics. V. Elsner Observ., and Raphel. Annot. ex Polybio, on this passage.

† See more particularly Raphel. Annot. loco citato.

epistles of St. John, by Dr. Friedrich Lücke. Translated from the German, with additional notes, by Thorleif Gudmundson Repp, pp. 279—287. Edinburgh: Thomas Clark, 1837. (Biblical Cabinet, No. xv.)

NOTE TO LECTURE V.

“What are dreams,” says one of our fine old writers, most deeply learned in all mystic lore, “but the imaginations and perceptions of one asleep, which, notwithstanding, steal upon the soul, or rise out of her, without any consent of hers: as is most manifest in such as torment us and put us to extreme pain till we awake out of them. And the like obreptions or unavoidable importunities of thoughts, which offer or force themselves upon the mind, may be observed even in the daytime, according to the nature or complexion of our bodies; though how the body doth engage the mind in the thoughts and imaginations is most manifest in sleep. For according as choler, sanguine, phlegm, or melancholy, are predominant, will the scene of our dreams be, and that without any check or curb of dubitation concerning the truth and existence of the things that then appear: of which we can conceive no other reason than this—that the inmost seat of the sense is very fully and vigorously affected, as it is by objects in the day, of whose real existence the ordinary assurance is, that they so strongly strike or affect our sensitive faculty which resides not in the external organs, no more than the artificer’s skill is in his instruments, and therefore, the true and real seat of sense being affected in our sleep, as well as when we are awake, tis the less marvel the soul conceits her dreams, while she is dreaming, to be no dreams, but real transactions. Imagination is then far stronger than any motion or agitation from without, which to them that are awake dims and obscures their inward imagination, as the light of the sun doth the light of a candle in a room; and yet, in this case, also, according to Aristotle, fancy is a *kind of sense, though weak*. But if it were so strong as to bear itself against all the occurrences and impulses of outward objects, so as not to be broken, but to keep itself entire and in equal splendour and vigour with what is represented from without, and this not

arbitrarily, but necessarily and unavoidably, as has been already intimated, the party thus affected would not fail to take his own imagination for a real object of sense—as in mad or melancholy men, who have confidently affirmed that they have met with the devil, or conversed with angels, when it has been nothing, but an encounter with their own fancy: and if it be so strong as to assure us of the presence of some external object which yet is not there, why may it not be as effectual in the begetting of the belief of some more internal apprehensions, such as have been reported of mad and fanatical men who have so firmly and immutably fancied themselves to be *God the Father*, the *Messias*, the *Holy Ghost*, the *angel Gabriel*, the *last and chiefest prophet* that God would send into the world, and the like? For their conceptions are not so pure or immaterial, nor solid or rational, but that these words to them are always accompanied with some strong phantom or full imagination, the fulness and clearness whereof, as in the case immediately before named, does naturally bear down the soul into a belief of the truth and existence of what she thus vigorously apprehends; and being so wholly and entirely immersed in this conceit, and so vehemently touched therewith, she has either not the patience to consider anything alleged against it, or if she do consider, and find herself entangled, she will look upon it as a piece of human sophistry, and prefer her own infallibility or the fallibility of the Spirit before all *carnal reasoning* whatsoever. As those whose fancies are fortified by long use and education in any absurd point of a false religion—though wise enough in other things—will firmly hold the conclusion notwithstanding the clearest demonstration to the contrary. Now what custom and education doth by degrees, distempered fancies may do in a shorter time. But the case in both is much like that in dreams, where that which is represented is necessarily taken for true, because nothing stronger enervates the perception. For as the ligations of the outward organs of sense keeps off such fluctuations or undulations of motion from without as might break or obscure these representations in sleep, so prejudice, and confidence in a conceit when a man is awake, keeps his fond imagination vigorous, and entire from all the assaults of reason that would cause any dubitation.” The same masculine writer says again;—“It is very well known that this

complexion is the most religious complexion that is, and will be as naturally tampering with Divine matters, (though in no better light than their own) as apes and monkeys will be aping the actions and manners of men. Neither is there any true spiritual grace from God, but this mere natural constitution—according to the several tempers and workings of it,—will not only resemble, but sometimes seem to outstrip, by reason of the fury and excess of it; and that, not only in actions, but very ordinarily in eloquence, and expression: as if here alone were to be had that live sense and understanding of all holy things, or at least, as if there were no other state to be paralleled to it. The event of which must be—if a very great measure of the true grace of God does not intervene—that such a person as this must be very highly puffed up, and not only fancy himself inspired, but believe himself such a special piece of light and holiness that God has sent into the world, that he will take upon him to reform, or rather annul, the very law and religion he is born under, and make himself not at all inferior to either Moses or Christ, though he have neither very sound reason nor visible miracle to extort belief.”

Referring to *mystical interpretations of the Scriptures*, and visions, he says;—“As for the first, we have shown that melancholy as well as wine, makes a man rhetorical or poetical, and that genius—how fanciful it is, and full of allusions, and metaphors, and fine resemblances, every one knows. And what greater matter is there in applying moral and spiritual meaning to the history of the Bible, than to the history of nature? and there is no rhetorician, nor poet, but does that perpetually; or how much easier is it to make a story to set out a moral meaning, than to apply a moral sense to such stories as are already a plot! And for the former, Æsop was, of old, excellent at it, without any suspicion of inspiration: and the latter, Sir Francis Bacon has admirably well performed in his *Sapientia Veterum*, without any such peculiar or extraordinary illapses of a Divine spirit in him—a business I dare say, he never dreamed of, and any man that understands him, will willingly be his compurgator. In both these, there being a ligation of the outward senses, whatever is then represented to the mind is of the nature of a dream.

But these fits being not so ordinary as our natural sleep, these

dreams the precipitant and unskilful are forward to conceit to be representations extraordinary and supernatural, which they call *revelations* or *visions*, of which there can be no certainty at all, no more than of a dream.

“The mention of dreams puts me in mind of another melancholy symptom, which physicans call *extasy* The causes whereof are none other than those of natural sleep, but more intense and excessive; the effect is the deliration of the party after he awakes; for he takes his dreams for true histories, and real transactions. The reason whereof I conceive, is the extraordinary clearness and fulness of the representations in his sleep, arising from a more perfect privation of all communion with this outward world; and so, there being no interferences or cross-strokes of motions from his body so deeply overwhelmed and bedeaded with sleep—what the imagination then puts forth of herself is as clear as noon-day, and the perception of the soul is at least as strong and vigorous as it is at any time in beholding things awake; and, therefore, memory as thoroughly sealed therewith as from the sense of any external object. The vigour and clearness of these visions differ from those in ordinary sleep as much as the liveliness of the images let into a room artificially darkened, from those in one carelessly made dark, (when) some clinks and crevices let in light where they should not. But strength of perception is no sure ground of truth: and such visions as these, let them be never so clear, yet they are still in the nature of dreams; and he that regardeth dreams is like him that catcheth at a shadow, or followeth after the wind, as Syracides speaks.”

After prescribing some remedies for these disorders of enthusiasm, the writer proceeds, with profound wisdom, and with exquisite beauty of thought and expression: “By *humility*, I mean an entire submission to the will of God in all things, a deadness to all self-excellence and pre-eminency before others: a perfect privation of all desire of singularity, or attracting of the eyes of men upon a man’s own person: as little to relish a man’s own praise or glory in the world, as if he had never been born into it; but to be wholly contented with this one thing—that his will is a subduing to the will of God, and that with thankfulness and reverence he doth

receive whatever Divine Providence brings upon him, be it sweet or sour, with the hair or against it; it is all one to him; for what he cannot avoid, it is the gift of God to the world in order to a greater good. But here I must confess that he that is thus affected, as he seeks no knowledge to please himself, so he cannot avoid being the most knowing man that is: for he is surrounded with the beams of Divine wisdom, as the low depressed earth with the rays of the stars; his deeply and profoundly humbled soul being as it were the centre of all heavenly illuminations, as this little globe of the earth is of those celestial influences. I profess I stand amazed while I consider the ineffable advantages of a mind thus submitted to the Divine will, how calm, how quiet, and sensible she is, how free, how sagacious, of how tender a touch and judgment she is in all things; whereas pride and strong desire ruffle the mind into uneven waves, and boisterous fluctuations, that the eternal light of reason concerning either nature or life cannot imprint its perfect and distinct image or character there, nor can so subtle and delicate motions and impressions be sensible to the understanding disturbed and agitated, in so violent a storm. That man, therefore, who has got this *humble frame of spirit*, which is of such mighty concernment for acquiring all manner of wisdom, as well natural as divine, cannot possibly be so foolish as to be mistaken in that which is the genuine result of a contrary temper: and such is that of enthusiasm that puffs up men into an opinion that they have a more than ordinary influence from God that acts upon their spirits, and that he designs them by special appointment to be *new prophets, new lawgivers, new Davids, new Messiahs*, and what not? When it is but the working of the old man in them in a fanatical manner."*

* *Enthusiasmus Triumphatus, or a Discourse of the Nature, Causes, Kinds and Cure of Enthusiasm.* By Henry More. London, 1656.

INDEX.

- Abiding presence of the Spirit of God in the spirit of man, 145—cause of the difference between the saved and the lost, 147.
- Adam and Christ, analogy between, 341.
- Analogies suggested by material nature inappropriate as grounds of reasoning on spiritual agency, 171.
- Apostolical instructions, high moral tone of, 381.
- Augustine, 363.
- Belief of the Gospel, effects of, on the emotions, 316.
- Believer, the, conscious of regarding the Gospel as spoken to him by the Spirit, 312—of finding there the reasons why he acts differently from others, 318—of receiving from the Gospel encouragements to persevere, 319—of finding in the Gospel needful checks, 323—of deriving from the Gospel peace and hope, 325—of finding scope for the sympathies of his social nature, 326—not able to distinguish the workings of his own mind from the working of the Spirit of God, 327.
- Bible, characteristics of, 102 — its prophecies, 103 — unity, 105 — scope, 106 — miracles, 107 — accounts of the ministry of Christ and the apostles, 109—proofs of its inspiration, 115.
- Boehm, 266.
- Bourignon, Antoinette, 267.
- Christian character, peculiarity of, 150—the pledge of endless happiness, 153.
- Christianity, illustrative of the Divine government, 181—design of, adapted to the nature and circumstances of man, 378—mischievous mode of dealing with, 384.
- Church of Christ, character of, 202—its relation to the civil polity of men, 230—descriptions of its *inward* government applied to the *outward* organization, 211.
- Church notions on the work of the Spirit—the source of hurtful controversies, 245—a hindrance to the spread of the Gospel, 249.
- Clement of Rome, on the appointment of church officers, 240.
- Coleridge, 274—his principles, 277 —his distinction between the understanding and the reason, 280.
- “Common grace,” 368—defined, 371 —inappropriateness of the passages of Scripture quoted in support of, 372.
- Consciousness*, fundamental fact in relation to the human spirit, 7 —Christianity an affair of, 9—testimony of, to the workings of the spiritual life, 312—harmony of the truths of, with the statements of Scripture on the work of the Spirit, 168—relates only

- to the mind's own states and acts, 173.
- Covenants, old and new, distinction between, 215—spirituality of the new, 216.
- Distinctions and mutual relations in the Godhead, 82.
- Divine government, principle of, not violated by the work of God in the spirit of man, 54, 179.
- Divine knowledge, and special modes of attesting truth ascribed to the Spirit, 98.
- Doctrine of Scripture on the work of the Spirit, in harmony with human consciousness, 151.
- Ecclesiastical theory on the work of the Spirit, 206—modifications of this theory, 228.
- Enthusiastical explanation of the spiritual life, 350.
- Ethical philosophy, the spiritual life secures results which transcend the aims of, 382.
- Evangelicalism, 364 — practical power of, 364.
- Facts illustrative of the truths respecting the work of the Spirit in man, 192.
- False, the, in religion, preferred by man to the true, 28.
- Fathers, the, hierarchical bias of their writings, 242—mischievous effects of appealing to the traditions and usages of, 243.
- Fenelon, his vindication of Madame Guion, 286.
- Formalism, opposition to, generates mysticism, 258.
- Genesis v. 3, exposition of, 120.
- German mysticism, 272
- Gospel, its aspect of grace to all men, 334—design of the preaching of, 345—the simplicity of, gradual departure from, 203.
- Grace, 182—cause of the change in the spiritual condition of man, 187—harmony of the truths respecting, with the work of the Spirit, 183.
- Guion, Madame, 285.
- Happiness, man conscious of the desire of, 21.
- Hebrews vi. 4 — 6, exposition of, 116.
- Herbert, Lord Edward of Cherbury, 289.
- "Holy Ghost," &c., meaning of the phrase, 70—personality and agency of, 72—with the Father and the Son, one God, 77—works of, which do not renew and save men, 85, 95—His work in relation to the Mediator, 90—effects of the truth on the mind ascribed to Him, 117—harmony of the truths respecting, with other mysterious truths, 189.
- Human, the, in religion preferred by man to the Divine, 39.
- Ignatius Loyola, 302.
- Illumination, private, authority of, 351.
- Images of Scripture mistaken for descriptions of outward facts, 217.
- Inspiration, unscriptural view of, 100.
- Intelligence, man conscious of, 11.
- Institutions of the Gospel, tendency to secularize, 234.
- Irresistibleness of Divine grace, 174.
- Jacobi, 273.
- 1 John iii. 9; v. 18, exposition of, 388.
- Language, testimony of, to the workings of the human spirit, 3.
- Law of spiritual action, 237.

- Life, a mystery, 308.
- Literature, Christian, current strain of, 196.
- Marcus Antoninus, 195.
- Material, the, in religion preferred by man to the spiritual, 25.
- "Maxims of the Saints" condemned by the Pope, 287.
- "Means of grace," the allowable, and the mischievous uses of the phrase, 222.
- Molinos, 284.
- Moral constitution, man conscious of, 18.
- Moral government, the work of God in man does not necessarily arise out of the relations of, 56.
- Morality, the purest, the natural fruit of the spiritual life, 375.
- Münzer, 301.
- Mystery, a, the work of God in man, 58.
- Mysticism, definition of, 260—considered as speculative, 261—as contemplative, 283—as imaginative, 291—as practical, 299.
- Natural body, the, and the spiritual body, 163.
- Peasants' war in Germany, 300.
- Pelagianism, fallacy of, 362.
- Perfection, Christian, 385.
- Pietists and mystics, distinction between, 307.
- Plato, views of, on Divine influence, 193.
- Poiret, Pierre, 270.
- Pretenders to special sanctity and inspiration, 197.
- Promises relating to the work of the Spirit in man, 133.
- Quietists, 284.
- Regeneration, the grace of, supposed to be imparted through the ministrations of the church, 207.
- Religion, man's mode of dealing with, 25—her champions;—her enemies, 29.
- Responsibility unchanged by the work of the Spirit, 176, 366.
- Revelation, practical design of, in relation to the spiritual life, 342.
- Right, man conscious of the sense of, 16.
- Right of the church to impart spiritual blessings supposed to arise from a covenant relation to God, 213.
- Salvation, wrought by the Spirit of God in the spirit of man, 146.
- Sanctification, progress of, 161, 393—results, 162.
- Scriptures, the spirit in which they are to be consulted, 63—their teaching respecting the work of God in man, 69—mystical interpretation of, 292.
- Seneca, 195.
- Sentimental, the, in religion, preferred by man to the moral, 34.
- Soul and spirit, distinction between, 6.
- Speculative, the, in religion, preferred by man to the practical, 30.
- Spirit of man, its present state in relation to God, 23.
- Spirituality of God, the idea of, from man's spiritual nature, 65.
- Spirituality of man's nature, 2.
- Spiritual life, teaching of Scripture respecting, 328—originates in a distinct act of God, 329—has a relation to Christ, 330—produces the highest and most refined morality, 375—*traditional* explanations of, 349—*enthusiastical*, 350—philosophical, 352—transcends explanation, 357—na-

- ture and sources of the difficulties connected with, 319.
- Substitution, Christ for his people, 336.
- Swedenborg, Emanuel, 294.
- Tradition, church notions respecting the work of the Spirit, supported by, 239.
- Traditional explanation of the spiritual life, 349.
- Truth, effects of on the mind ascribed to the Spirit, 117.
- Truths respecting God and man, specific design of, 311.
- Unity of the Father and the Son and the Spirit, a mystery, yet a fact, 81.
- Usage, church notions respecting the work of the Spirit founded on, 239.
- Voluntary action, man conscious of, 15.
- Wants of the human spirit, 42—way in which they are to be supplied, 48.
- Work of God in man does no violence to the conscious freedom of man, 51, 169—mysterious, 58—must be clearly revealed in the Scriptures, 62—testimony of the Scriptures respecting, 132—144—does not oppose any principle of the government of God, 175—not miraculous, 191—distinction between this work and man's proper work, 361—not essential to the responsibility of man, 366.
- Wrong choice in man, cause of, 47.

Works by the same Author.

THE MISSIONARY CHURCH.

Second edition, 12mo., 3s.

Preparing for the Press.

MEMOIR OF THE LATE DR. HAMILTON, OF LEEDS,

WITH SELECTIONS FROM THE DOCTOR'S UNPUBLISHED PAPERS.

In one vol. 8vo.

LIST OF THE PREVIOUS VOLUMES OF
THE CONGREGATIONAL LECTURE.

1. Dr. Wardlaw.
CHRISTIAN ETHICS. Fourth Edition, foolscap 8vo., 6s. 6d. cloth.

2. Dr. Vaughan.
THE CAUSES OF THE CORRUPTION OF CHRISTIANITY.
8vo., 10s. 6d. cloth.

3. Rev. Joseph Gilbert.
THE CHRISTIAN ATONEMENT. 8vo., 10s. 6d. cloth.

4. Dr. Henderson.
DIVINE INSPIRATION. Second edition, foolscap 8vo., 6s. cloth.

5. Dr. Redford.
HOLY SCRIPTURE VERIFIED. 8vo., 12s. cloth.

6. Dr. John Pye Smith, F.R.S., F.G.S.
SCRIPTURE AND GEOLOGY. Fourth Edition, with many
Additions. 8vo., 9s. cloth.

7. Dr. William Lindsay Alexander.
THE CONNEXION AND HARMONY OF THE OLD AND
NEW TESTAMENTS. 8vo., 12s. cloth.

8. Dr. James Bennett.
THE THEOLOGY OF THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH.
8vo., 10s. 6d. cloth.

9. Rev. Walter Scott.
THE EXISTENCE OF EVIL SPIRITS. Second Edition,
foolscap 8vo., 6s. cloth.

10. Dr. Halley.
THE SACRAMENTS. Part I. BAPTISM. 8vo., 14s. cloth.

11. Dr. Payne.
THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN. 8vo., 10s. 6d. cloth.

12. Dr. Richard Winter Hamilton.
THE REVEALED DOCTRINE OF REWARDS AND
PUNISHMENTS. 8vo., 9s. cloth.

13. Dr. S. Davidson.
THE ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.
8vo., 9s. 6d. cloth.

Works recently Published by
JACKSON AND WALFORD.

In Post 8vo., 6s. cloth,

THE AGE AND CHRISTIANITY,

Six Lectures, delivered at the Hanover-square Rooms, in February and March, 1849.

By ROBERT VAUGHAN, D.D.

By the same Author,

In Two Volumes, foolscap 8vo., price 9s. cloth,

**ESSAYS ON HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY, AND
THEOLOGY.**

Selected from Contributions to the "British Quarterly Review."

Also by the same Author,

Second edition, in royal 12mo., price 7s. 6d. cloth,

THE AGE OF GREAT CITIES:

Or, Modern Civilization viewed in its relation to Intelligence, Morals, and Religion.

A NEW AND CHEAPER EDITION.

In two volumes, post 8vo., price 16s. cloth,

**THE LIFE AND CORRESPONDENCE OF
JOHN FOSTER.**

Edited by J. E. RYLAND.

With Notices of Mr. Foster as a Preacher and a Companion, by JOHN SHEPPARD,
Author of "Thoughts on Private Devotion," &c.

In foolscap 8vo., price 6s. cloth, Third Edition,

LECTURES by JOHN FOSTER.

FIRST SERIES.

Delivered at Broadmead Chapel, Bristol. Selected from the Author's Manuscripts,
and Edited by J. E. RYLAND.

Also in foolscap 8vo., price 6s. cloth, Second Edition,

LECTURES by JOHN FOSTER.

SECOND SERIES.

* * * The two last Works may be had uniform in cloth binding, and form a very
acceptable present to young Ministers and Students.

In post 8vo., price 9s., cloth lettered, with Engraved Frontispiece, and Woodcuts to illustrate various chapters,

SPIRITUAL HEROES:

OR,

Sketches of the Puritans,

THEIR CHARACTER AND TIMES.

By JOHN STOUGHTON,

AUTHOR OF "WINDSOR IN THE OLDEN TIME."

"There is some difficulty in conveying an adequate idea of the contents of the volume before us. With a hearty love of his heroes, and with more than ordinary insight into human nature, he has brought the stores of his matured and gifted mind, conversant as it is with all the facts of nonconforming history, to illustrate one of its most deeply interesting periods. The taste displayed in the getting-up of the book is in admirable keeping with the artistic skill of the author's mind. By this contribution he has laid his own denomination, and, indeed, the whole church of God, under deep obligation, which we trust will be suitably acknowledged by the wide circulation of his volume."—*Biblical Review*.

In foolscap 8vo., price 3s. cloth,

HORÆ ET VINDICIÆ SABBATICÆ:

OR,

FAMILIAR DISQUISITIONS ON THE REVEALED SABBATH.

By RICHARD WINTER HAMILTON, LL.D., D.D.

"From their poetic glow, and the high standing of their Author, we hope that Dr. Hamilton's 'Disquisitions' may carry a Sabbath into the study of many a lettered man. It glads us to encounter such firmness of faith in unison with philosophical enlargement, and it is pleasant to recognize, in terse and classic phrase, the tone and maxims of the Puritan."—*North British Review*.

In Two Volumes, 18mo., price 5s. bound,

SCRIPTURE LESSONS ON THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

In Question and Answer. Designed for the Use of Bible Classes. By MRS. HENDERSON. Forming a Sequel to her previous work, entitled, "Scripture Lessons; or, the History of our Lord."

"The volumes are neatly printed, and portable; and, so far as we have examined, their contents are characterized by sound biblical interpretation, the instruction conveyed by the sacred text being everywhere presented with a degree of simplicity and skill eminently adapted to the end proposed by the author. We strongly commend this new fruit of Mrs. Henderson's labours to all persons engaged in conducting Bible classes, or in domestic education."—*British Quarterly Review*.

In 18mo., illustrated with Twelve Wood Engravings, price 3s. cloth,

ON TREES,

THEIR USES AND BIOGRAPHY.

Being the substance, with additions, of Two Lectures, delivered before the Frome Institution, and in Bristol. By JOHN SHEPPARD, Author of "Thoughts on Devotion," &c.

"The trees of Jehovah are full of sap, the cedars of Lebanon which he hath planted."—Psalm civ. 16.

"A pleasing and instructive little work, containing an account of some of the most remarkable species of trees as well as individuals, accompanied with interesting remarks on their uses to man, and illustrated with plates."—*Gentleman's Magazine*.

By the same Author, in 18mo., price 2s. 6d. cloth,

ON DREAMS,

IN THEIR MENTAL AND MORAL ASPECTS,

As affording auxiliary arguments for the Existence of Spirit, for a "Separate State," and for a Particular Providence. In Two Essays.

"The tone of the volume is admirable. The abundant citations of cases—the fair, moderate conclusions established from them, and the marks of a ripe and cultivated mind on every page, make this a valuable contribution to the literature of a difficult subject."—*Eclectic Review*.

New and Cheaper Edition, in Two Vols., 8vo., price 24s. cloth,
THE SCRIPTURE TESTIMONY TO THE MESSIAH:

An Inquiry, with a view to a satisfactory Determination of the Doctrine taught
in the Holy Scriptures concerning the Person of Christ.

By JOHN PYE SMITH, D.D. LL.D.

Also by the same Author,

Third Edition, enlarged. Foolscap 8vo., price 6s. cloth,

FOUR DISCOURSES

ON THE SACRIFICE AND PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST,

And the Atonement and Redemption thence accruing. With Supplementary
Notes and Illustrations.

In foolscap 8vo., price 4s. 6d. cloth,

CURÆ ROMANÆ,

A Revised Translation of the Epistle to the Romans: with Notes, Explanatory
and Critical.

By WILLIAM WALFORD, Author of "A New Translation of the Psalms," &c.

In foolscap 8vo., price 4s. 6d. cloth, a Second Series of

LETTERS ON PURITANISM AND NONCONFORMITY.

By Sir JOHN BICKERTON WILLIAMS, Knt., LL.D., F.S.A., Author of "Memoirs of
the Life, Character, and Writings of Sir Matthew Hale, Knt."

In royal 12mo., price 5s. cloth,

AN ESSAY ON THE

PROFESSION OF PERSONAL RELIGIOUS CONVICTION,

And upon the Separation of Church and State.

CONSIDERED WITH REFERENCE TO THE FULFILMENT OF THAT DUTY.

BY THE LATE A. VINET,

Professor of Practical Theology in the Academy of Lausanne.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH BY CHARLES THEODORE JONES.

In foolscap 8vo., price 3s. 6d. cloth,

A WREATH FOR THE TOMB.

An Essay and a Sermon on the Lessons taught by Sickness, with Extracts from
eminent Authors on Death and Eternity. By EDWARD HITCHCOCK, LL.D.
Second Edition, with a Recommendatory Preface by Dr. PYE SMITH.

In foolscap 8vo. with Portrait, price 4s. 6d. cloth,

MEMOIRS AND SELECT REMAINS OF THE


REV. THOMAS RAWSON TAYLOR,

Late Classical Tutor at Airedale College, Yorkshire. Second Edition, with an
Introduction by JAMES MONTGOMERY, Esq.

In Four Volumes, 12mo., price 1l. 4s. cloth,

SKETCHES OF SERMONS,

Preached in Various Parts of the United Kingdom, and on the European Con-
tinent; furnished by their respective Authors. With an Index of Texts, &c. A
New Edition, carefully Revised and Corrected, (the Eight Volumes reprinted in Four.)

 Either Volume may be had separately, containing 100 Sermons, price 6s.

